

BL

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY

NOV 16 1949

Anglican Theological Review



EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

FOUNDED BY SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXXI

OCTOBER, 1949

NUMBER 4

CONTENTS

The Theological Enterprise and the Life of the Church	
	<i>W. Norman Pittenger</i> 189
The Prayer Book and the Bible ..	<i>Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.</i> 197
Authority and Freedom	<i>A. Gabriel Hebert</i> 208
Criteria for the Esoteric Logia in Mark ..	<i>Oscar J. F. Seitz</i> 218
Priesthood and Reunion	<i>Louis A. Haselmayer</i> 224
Theology Looks at ESP	<i>J. Randolph Field</i> 239
The Place of Origin of Matthew's Gospel	
	<i>J. Spencer Kennard, Jr.</i> 243
Book Reviews	247
Notes on New Books	258

PUBLISHED BY

ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

600 HAVEN STREET
EVANSTON, ILLINOIS

UNIVERSITY PRESS
SEWANEE, TENNESSEE

\$1.00 A NUMBER

\$3.50 A YEAR

Anglican Theological Review

VOLUME XXXI

JULY, 1949

NUMBER 3

EDITOR: THE REV. FREDERICK CLIFTON GRANT, D.D., Th.D., D.S.Litt., D.C.L., Professor of Biblical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York City

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: THE REV. BURTON SCOTT EASTON, S.T.D., Ph.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Interpretation, General Theological Seminary

BOOK REVIEW EDITOR: THE REV. HOLT HUTTON GRAHAM, M.A., Instructor in New Testament, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: THE REV. PERCY VARNEY NORWOOD, M.A., Ph.D., S.T.D., Professor of Church History, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary

EDITORIAL BOARD

- | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| REV. ARTHUR ADAMS, Ph.D. | REV. DANIEL A. MCGREGOR, Ph.D. |
| RT. REV. DONALD B. ALDRICH, D.D. | REV. SAMUEL A. B. MERCER, D.D., Ph.D. |
| RT. REV. STEPHEN F. BAYNE, Jr., S.T.D. | REV. RANDOLPH C. MILLER, Ph.D. |
| PROF. FRANK W. BUCKLER, S.T.D. | REV. ARNOLD S. NASH, D.D. |
| PRES. GORDON KEITH CHALMERS, Ph.D. | RT. REV. NORMAN B. NASH, S.T.D. |
| RT. REV. WALLACE E. CONKLING, D.D. | REV. WILLIAM H. NES, D.D., D.C.L. |
| RT. REV. ANGUS DUN, D.D. | RT. REV. EDWARD L. PARSONS, D.D. |
| RT. REV. RICHARD S. M. EMRICH, Ph.D. | REV. W. NORMAN PITTENGER, S.T.D. |
| REV. CHARLES R. FEILDING, M.A. | REV. CYRIL C. RICHARDSON, Th.D. |
| REV. THEODORE P. FERRIS, D.D. | REV. HOWARD C. ROBBINS, D.D. |
| REV. JOSEPH F. FLETCHER, S.T.D. | REV. LAWRENCE ROSE, D.D. |
| REV. ARTHUR HAIRE FORSTER, Ph.D. | REV. MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, Jr., Ph.D. |
| REV. H. E. W. FOSBROKE, D.D., LL.D. | RT. REV. HENRY KNOX SHERRILL, D.D. |
| REV. ROBERT MCQUEEN GRANT, Th.D. | REV. HENRY H. SHIRES, D.D. |
| RT. REV. WALTER H. GRAY, D.D. | REV. CUTHBERT A. SIMPSON, Th.D. |
| PROF. LEWIS M. HAMMOND, Ph.D. | REV. CHARLES L. STREET, Ph.D. |
| REV. EDWARD R. HARDY, Jr., Ph.D. | RT. REV. ROBERT E. L. STRIDER, D.D. |
| REV. LOUIS A. HASELMAYER, Jr., Ph.D. | REV. CHARLES L. TAYLOR, Jr., Th.D. |
| REV. FLEMING JAMES, D.D. | RT. REV. BEVERLEY D. TUCKER, D.D. |
| REV. SHERMAN E. JOHNSON, Ph.D. | RT. REV. H. ST. GEORGE TUCKER, D.D. |
| REV. ALDEN DREW KELLEY, D.D. | REV. PERCY L. URBAN, S.T.D. |
| REV. PAUL STEVENS KRAMER, Ph.D. | PROF. JOACHIM WACH, Ph.D. |
| REV. CHARLES W. LOWRY, Jr., Ph.D. | REV. THEODORE OTTO WEDEL, Ph.D. |
| PROF. JOHN S. MARSHALL, Ph.D. | REV. WALTER FREEMAN WHITMAN, D.D. |
| RT. REV. FRANK A. McELWAIN, D.D. | REV. ALEXANDER C. ZABRISKIE, S.T.D. |

COOPERATING INSTITUTIONS

- | | |
|---|---|
| BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL, New Haven, Connecticut | NASHOTAH HOUSE, Nashotah, Wisconsin |
| THE CHURCH CONGRESS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH | TRINITY COLLEGE, Hartford, Connecticut |
| CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC, Berkeley, California | TRINITY COLLEGE, Toronto, Ontario |
| EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, Cambridge, Massachusetts | UNIVERSITY OF THE SOUTH, Seawanee, Tennessee |
| GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Chelsea Square, New York City | PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA, Alexandria, Virginia |
| KENYON COLLEGE, Gambier, Ohio | SEABURY-WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, Evanston, Illinois |

The REVIEW is published four times a year, as follows: January, April, July, October. Subscription price \$3.50 annually. Single copies, \$1.00.

All editorial communications and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Treasurer, the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Books for review should be sent to the Book Review Editor, the Rev. Holt H. Graham, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Entered as second-class matter, August 8, 1931, at the post-office at Evanston, Illinois, under the act of March 3, 1879; with additional entry at the post-office at Seawanee, Tennessee.



V

T

v
in
t
t
d
n
to
t
D
n
s
A
A
s
th
s
in
d
r
th
s
th
e
b

Anglican Theological Review

EDITED BY

FREDERICK C. GRANT AND BURTON S. EASTON

Founded by SAMUEL A. B. MERCER

VOLUME XXXI

OCTOBER, 1949

NUMBER 4

THE THEOLOGICAL ENTERPRISE AND THE LIFE OF THE CHURCH

By W. NORMAN PITTENGER

General Theological Seminary

Presidential address to the American Theological Society, April 22, 1949.

Certainly one of the significant developments in the Christian community in America during the past decade or two has been the re-establishment of theology as a respectable enterprise. Indeed this is a world phenomenon, not merely an American one; and it appears to have repercussions outside the Christian fellowship as well as within it. During the past year, for example, I noted that Mr. Harold J. Laski in his stimulating if often irritating study of American life and institutions, *The American Democracy*, spoke with respect of the work of theologians, even though he dissented from their conclusions. Mr. Laski, himself no believer, indicated that a religious body without dogmas, and dogmas which it held in relationship to the current world of thought and action, was ineffectual and somewhat inane. He went on to charge the churches of America with this fault, even as he also criticized them for being a support of a dying social order;

unhappily, Mr. Laski has not kept as closely abreast of the current in religion as he has with that in politics, for if he had done so, he would have noted that since 1930 at least, the churches in America have become acutely conscious of the theological foundations upon which they rest, as well as increasingly aware of the need for a profound and penetrating criticism of our social order.

In any event, those of us who are part of the American scene and thereby closely in touch with the movements of thought in the Christian bodies here at home, can testify that theology has returned, and that a keen interest in problems which are essentially dogmatic is to be found wherever we turn. In the seminaries, for instance, the students turn most readily to the theological departments for inspiration and guidance. And in the parishes, the most frequent questions from laymen are likely to be, "What is the Christian position on this

or that problem, and what is the Christian belief about this or that matter?" rather than "What shall we do now?" I do not think that it is going too far to say that we are a long way from the situation which Mr. Paul Elmer More once described to me as prevalent in the nineteen-twenties. "There is a creed nowadays", he remarked, "which seems to me to be very strange indeed. It runs, 'I believe in the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the leadership of Jesus, salvation by character, and the progress of the human race upward and onward.' Now I should add to that strange creed", he continued, "only one clause. It should end with the words, 'And I believe in the neighbourhood of Boston.'"

Mr. More was not very kind to New England, but he surely was portraying a sort of creedless creed, a non-theological religion, that has had its day and that is now ceasing to be. We are going back, all of us, to a theological religion, indeed a dogmatic religion; which is to say, we are returning to theology as a respectable and essential element in the life of the Christian Church.

But what is theology? What is the theological enterprise? What is its part and place in the on-going life of the Christian Church? It is to questions of this sort that I would direct your attention. For, as it seems to me, at least some of the zeal for theology which we see about us is a rather uninformed zeal, largely because the prior question as to the nature of theology has not been investigated. And that precipitate rush into a subject, without consideration of prolegomena, may be described

not unfairly as a rather uniquely American characteristic.

Now we are talking about Christian theology, and it is important that we remember that adjectives are significant. *Christian* theology is by its very name different from other kinds of theology; which, by implication, brings the question: what do we mean by "Christian"? I may betray my particular religious affiliation by my definition, although I think that general agreement could be found for it today. In any case, I should wish to define "Christian" to mean a peculiar point of view, a position, a *stance*, within the living tradition of Christian faith, worship and life. That is to say, to describe anything as Christian is to assert that it springs out of, bears upon, and finds its meaning within the Christian Church itself, with its gospel centering in the action of God in Christ for the salvation of the world.

A classical statement defines theology as "the science of God and his relation to the world." This will serve our purposes adequately; but for a Christian theology, we must go on to say that this implies that the study of God, so far as this is possible for finite man, and the consideration of his relations with the world, must be seen in the light of the *existence*, the given reality, of the Christian Church, with its faith, its devotion and its "life in grace." This point has been argued admirably by Canon Richardson in his recent *Christian Apologetics*. As I should myself prefer to put it, Christian theology is the attempt to explicate and express the implications found in the corporate Christian life-in-faith, springing from the gospel of God's redemptive work, as that is known and lived by the faith-

ful, both today and for two thousand years. It involves, therefore, a dependence upon, an acquaintance with, the great theological stream of the past—for example, the Apologists, the "Fathers", the Cappadocians, St. Augustine, St. Hilary, the mediaeval thinkers like Aquinas and Bonaventura and Scotus, as well as on the Reformation divines such as Luther and Calvin and their followers, the Carolines in England, and more recent figures such as Schleiermacher and others.

In other words, it is not *Christian* theology, in my sense, to start afresh, without the tradition from which we came and to which we as believers must belong. It does not seem possible, in my opinion, to call by the adjective "Christian" an enterprise such as that which I once found described in a summer-session announcement; "The Christian Faith. After lectures by the instructor, the student will construct his own statement of belief, on the basis of his study of the New Testament, modern philosophy, and the scientific world-view." That curious description would seem more appropriate to some bright new variety of "christianized theism" than to the attempt to appropriate the Christian faith in all of its historic richness, finding in it a reason for living and a meaning for life.

What I have been saying is, in effect, that theology is for the Christian in the first instance "confessional", although the Confession may not be (as it usually is on the continent of Europe) a Reformation document, but (as with the Anglican Communion) the historic creeds as the *regula fidei*. For myself, I should more naturally write this, "Theology is

an enterprise of the Christian Church as it seeks to understand the faith by which it lives." But you will note that I said, "in the first instance"; I said it advisedly. For it seems to me that there is a rather considerable danger if we stop at this point—a danger to which some of the continental writers to whom I have just now referred are peculiarly exposed. Although I share the opinion of many that Karl Barth is in most ways a more liberal thinker and a more fruitful guide than his apparently more congenial opponent Emil Brunner, I cannot help but feel that at this particular point he is a very bad guide indeed and a very intransigent thinker.

A theology which is "of the church" alone is in grave peril of becoming the concern simply of "those who happen to think that way"; it has failed to ground itself in that common universe of experience and speech which guarantees an extended, indeed a universal, relevance to its deliverances. Granted that the special contents of Christian theology will not be *accepted* by all men, without the gift of faith and a deep "churchly appurtenance" (in von Hügel's phrase), it ought yet to be true that the Christian theology will be *acceptable* in the sense that it will have a bearing upon, a relationship to, and a significance for the experience of men generally. In other words, Christian theology—while it is at first "of the Church"—is also "rational" or "philosophical." By this I do not mean that it must be confined to or entirely contained within the "limits of human reason", in Kant's words; obviously there will be areas of Christian thought which go far beyond that, and

the whole position will assume a quite different set of postulates from philosophy in its secular sense. But, and upon this I for one should wish to insist, it must not be cut off from the ordinary intellectual enterprise of man, as this finds itself supremely expressed in his endeavour, by reasoning and hard thought, "to make sense" of the world and of his experience as living within it.

Miss Dorothy Emmet, in a remarkable essay included in her little book, *Philosophy and Faith*, has handled this subject in a masterly fashion; I can only refer you to it for amplification of the position which I myself should hold. The theologian, then, has a foot in both camps: he is, first, a Christian who accepts the Church's faith—as stated, definitely but not exhaustively, in the historic creeds, shall we say?—and who lives in the Church, whole-heartedly participating in its adoration of God and in its redeemed life; he is, also, a thinker who must bring that faith to bear upon the changing life of the world, while he seeks to learn from that rich movement of experience and thought something of the continuing impact of God as he constantly reveals himself to men of good-will. It so happened that as I was preparing this address I came across an apt description of the theologian's task, in M. J. Scheeben's great book *Mysteries of Christianity*. That noted German Roman Catholic writer said that one might understand this problem in the light of the Incarnation. As the Blessed Mother of Christ conceived, by the operation of the Holy Spirit, the human nature of the Word or Reason of God, so "reason, wedded in faith to the same Holy Spirit by his grace, conceives in the light of faith

shed by him, the divine truth contained in the Word of God." Had Scheeben here added—as of course he would wish to imply—that the reason which functions in theology is a Church-informed reason, he would have expressed the position which I should want to take.

A beloved teacher of my student days, Frank Gavin, used often to remark that in his judgment the best defense of Christianity was a statement of it that was as clear and as reasonable as possible. That remark is illuminating for the theologian's task. For the theologian is, in large degree, engaged in a "defensive" work; he is seeking to develop, from the given tradition of Christian faith, a statement of the content of that faith which, because it is the meaning of human experience in this world of our experiencing, shall also be meaningful in the widest possible fashion and inclusive of as much truth as can be encompassed by man. When in the Nicene Creed we affirm our faith in the Incarnate Word, we go on to say that it is by that same Word, who in Jesus Christ was incarnate "for us men and for our salvation", that "all things were made"; and when the Fourth Gospel proclaims the Word who was in the beginning with God and who was God, it asserts that "by him all things were made, and without him nothing was made that was made." He who became Man is he who is "the light that lightens every man." A theology of the Word Incarnate must, therefore, be a theology of the Word in creation; and that implies, and indeed demands, that not only nothing human, but also nothing natural, is alien to the Christian theologian who seeks to see all things in the light of Christ.

But it is equally obvious that there are elements in the Christian faith which are not patient of rational demonstration. St. Thomas Aquinas understood this, in a way different from that of the newer theologians; and while unquestionably his manner of division and his mode of description cannot be defended today, his insistence upon "supernatural truths" is still valid, if by this we can mean truth derived not from philosophical enquiry but from God's revelation in act. I have quoted Scheeben once before; I find him useful again, although any classical or traditional theologian would have done as well, when he states that to this sphere belong such affirmations as "the Trinity . . . man's original righteousness . . . sin in general and original sin in particular, . . . the Incarnation, . . . the Eucharist, . . . the Church, . . . the sacraments, . . . Christian justification, . . . the glorification of man in soul and body" (and by implication, the glorification of material nature as it "realizes its final purpose"). Truths such as these are proposed to us by our Christian faith; they are not achieved by the use of the human reason, even when aided by grace, but are implied in the act of God in revelation. Yet they are truths which are in relation to our wider experience and thought; hence they are not irrational, but may be placed in the total organism of Christian meaning, implied (to some extent, at least) by much of human experience and thought, discussed by men although only by the method of analogy, and shown to be not essentially contradictory to but fulfilments of that which we can discover of limited meaning in our own condi-

tioned and conditional investigation and explication of the world and man.

But, we may legitimately ask, what is the starting-point for the whole theological task? To this I would answer, first, the tradition of the Christian Church, in its three-fold aspect of faith, worship, and life in grace; but I must go behind that to say that this tradition itself rests back upon historical events and their interpretation as meaningful. Here we are at once dependent upon the Holy Scriptures. For in the pages of the Bible we read the story told through history, poetry, legend, myth, of those events and experiences, the experience of fact and the fact of experience, which in dramatic or epic form represents the movement of God in the history of a chosen people. The Bible is a record of revelation; it is also the record of men's apprehension of that which God revealed, or better, of the God who reveals *himself*. The Scriptures are part of the Christian tradition; but they are the normative part, establishing the criteria for our belief and practice. As the Anglican Articles of Religion put it, the Creeds "ought thoroughly to be received and believed: for they may be proved [that is, *tested*] by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." So likewise with Christian worship and Christian conduct. And so likewise with the developing theology of the Church.

All that I have said so far might make me sound like a very conservative theologian indeed. Nor should I be greatly disturbed if this were so. But there is more to be said, and here, doubtless, I shall sound like a "modernist", in the Roman Catholic sense of the term. For it is also true that the theologian's task is not only to explicate and state the

given faith, in relation to the world and human reason. It is also his task to re-state and re-formulate the faith, taking account of the new knowledge which we now possess concerning Christian origins, the Biblical picture generally, the world which science has disclosed to us, and whatever truths have been vouchsafed us from any place and in any sphere. He must be prepared to distinguish, for example, the total reality of God's impact upon men in the Incarnation from the particular events, miraculous or otherwise, which have been associated with that divine action. He must discriminate between what von Hügel called "the central nucleus" and the "peripheral" elements, in the tradition of the Church. He must deliver us from obscurantism, on the one hand, as he must save us from the cult of the contemporaneous, on the other. Above all, he must be generous in his recognition of the divine operation in very unlikely Nazareths and in surprising Calvaries, as he finds God at work either partially or in some strange incognito in every area where supreme succour is given to men or supreme demand made upon men. It would be ungrateful and ungracious if I did not say here that Paul Tillich has taught us this truth, for our generation, in a way that is both profound and deeply rewarding.

And from this I must go on to say that we ought to be suspicious of every attempt to confine theology to the realm of "the personal", overlooking that realm of the subconscious, the vital, the almost biological and physical, in which so much about life and about God is to be found. Catholic Christianity, with its deep sacramentalism, has much to teach Protestant Christianity at this

point; even as Protestant Christianity, by its firm insistence on the clarity of God's Word, has much to tell Catholicism. And, in my opinion, Eastern Orthodoxy most of all has much to give us in the West, with its magnificent picture of the whole created order, from man down to dust, redeemed and significant for the salvation which God has for his world.

I should like to dwell on this matter, because it seems to me that far too much of our theology today tends to restrict our thinking about, and our application of, the gospel of Christ and its meaning to what one might call a verbal encounter. It is not without importance that in much traditional Christian writing, the analogy frequently chosen for the relation of the soul to God is that of human marriage. Union deeper than any words can contain is here declared to be the goal of the Christian. The truth is, I am sure, that theology must make room for the rich and wonderful way by which God moves into and works through man, by suggestion, by physical impression, by *things*, as well as by words spoken or ideas received in the mind. If by "personal" one can understand and include all of these subtle facts about human experience, I should be satisfied; but I cannot help entertaining the suspicion that much of theologizing is not only too anthropocentric, in the sense that man and man's problems are too central, but also too ideo-centric (if I may coin the word), in that ideas, concepts, notions, and the communication of them, are taken to be the whole story.

Nor must I neglect to point out that theology must learn from morality and must imply a morality—in the first in-

stance taking account of man's moral experience generally and even recognizing the widely diffused presence of some understanding of a moral law; and in the second, aiding in the development of a moral standard which shall be the consequence of the Christian understanding of the meaning of life, and hence different from general human morality. But as I should vigorously insist, this does not imply that theology be equated with morality or even with moral theology. In fact, it is probably true that one of the reasons for the abdication of theology as a genuinely respectable enterprise, during the last few decades, was that it had been so identified with ethics and with moral philosophy, that it seemed to have little to do or say, of and for itself.

What I should wish to maintain is that theology is an enterprise in its own right, involving historical knowledge (hence historical theology), a statement of the Christian position (hence dogmatic or systematic theology), and a consideration of that position in the light of knowledge in every other sphere (hence apologetics or philosophical theology). Once the Christian view of life has been stated, however, there are necessary corollaries. These include the *end* for which man exists and the way to it (hence moral theology); they involve also a view of man's growth in grace, as he walks in the Christian way (hence ascetical theology), and a rationale of man's treatment by God through the Church's established techniques (hence penitential theology).

In all of these, the same set of principles must hold true. The tradition is given in the sense that it is the community's life-in-faith, expressed in the

several ways which we have considered, that is in question. But the tradition is not given in a vacuum; it is to be related to, and suitably stated for, a changing world, with all of the novelty which that involves and with all of the truth which God day-by-day reveals to his children in their secular life, in their scientific research, in their aesthetic appreciation, in their common thought and ordinary experience. All of this is to be claimed by the theologian, used by him for the better understanding and statement of the faith and its implications, and revered as truth imparted by God "in divers portions and manners."

In effect, what we have done is to assert that the theologian is one who is committed, by profession of faith, to the *Church's* faith; but he is also one who is commissioned, by virtue of his peculiar gifts, to bring the "riches of the Gentiles" to the service of the Church, while he never seeks to claim presumptuously to "have" the truth, but only to act as steward for that which God has given to his children.

Much more could be said; much more should be said. But time will permit no more than two closing comments. The first is that the theological enterprise, as I have sought to describe it, is one that necessarily involves tension—tension between the given tradition and the world of secular thought; tension between the formulations which we have inherited and the newer insights which we have been granted; tension between the differing schools of theology, and also between the several traditions which are contained within the Christian community. We ought not to evade this tension; it is the definition, so to say, of our human limitation and sin. Our

theologies are not correct maps of heaven and earth; they are attempts of men, within the community of grace, to understand the meaning of life in the light of the faith by which they live. It is only beyond the contradictions and confusions of this mortal life that we can know the Truth which is God himself. Our theologies are at best pointers towards him and we must never make them absolute nor claim for them that they have exhausted even the little truth which our tiny minds can grasp. In the end of the day, we must confess that

God in his own interpreter
And He will make it plain.

The second comment is that every theologian today, as indeed every Christian, is inevitably a "schizophrenic." By this I mean that our culture is so imperfectly Christian, perhaps one should say is so genuinely unchristian in that it is based upon assumptions and presuppositions which are contradictory to all that historic Christianity maintains, that we who believe are torn in spirit and divided in mind. But the theologian can make one enormous contribution at this particular time. For he, at least, is or ought to be conscious of his "schizophrenia." He knows that our culture is alien to our faith, he sees the conflict in assumptions and presuppositions, he is vividly aware of the split that exists between the faith which alone can give meaning to life and the life which seeks some meaning that is more cheaply bought. Because this is so, he can articulate the inner rift in the thought and common life of our own day, make clear the allegiance which is natural for the truly integral Christian, suggest the

necessary compromises which will make life at least viable, and point towards syntheses of thought and action with Christian faith and conduct that may help towards a new and better day. This is both a challenge and an opportunity which we dare not neglect.

And so, in conclusion, I would say that the theological enterprise is one which involves the whole man, the whole *believing* man, who has disciplined himself to the use of reason but who does not assume that human reason is competent to tell the entire story; who seeks to understand the content and the context of the given tradition of his communion, in the light of the given tradition of the whole Catholic Church of Christ in its long historical development; who endeavours to re-state that tradition in the light of all the knowledge available and accessible in our own day, and to relate it to the culture in which he lives—all of this without reducing the content of the faith, yet without neglecting the necessary readjustments and modifications which the new learning may imply. The old saying, *pectus facit theologum*, is right; but it would be better, and truer, to say that the "supreme end and object of theology, and the focus of its continually evolving wisdom" is the incarnate Wisdom of God, as through his mystical Body the Church that Wisdom seeks to lead us to "the objective centre, the root, and the summit" of all wisdom, from whom the Word himself proceeds, to whom he himself returns, and in whom life, all life—whether it be physical or spiritual, non-Christian or Christian—has its only meaning and its only end.

THE PRAYER BOOK AND THE BIBLE

By MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

Episcopal Theological School

This article is a condensation of material from the Easter Lectures, delivered at Bexley Hall, April 26-27, 1949, on the general themes of *The Prayer Book and the Bible*, and *The Prayer Book and Christian Doctrine*. A second article from this series, on the Eucharistic Lectionary, will appear in a forthcoming issue.

We are prone today so to deplore the divisive and disparate effects of the Reformation movement of the sixteenth century that we commonly fail to appreciate the larger unities in essential principles held in common by the chief reformers of the time. Sectarian religion was neither invented nor intended by the Protestant leaders who broke away from the papal allegiance. Its roots lay in the heretical groups of anti-clerical sentiment and puritan piety which emerged in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Repressed and driven under cover by the medieval Church, yet never completely suppressed or absorbed by it into recognized religious orders, as in the case of the Franciscan Movement, these sectaries protruded once more into the open through the stimulus of the Reformation controversies. But they were persecuted with the same vigor and zeal by the great Reformers as ever they were by medieval popes and prelates. The confessional standards of faith drawn up by the reformed Churches, among them the Articles of Religion of the English Church, were designed to counter the errors of the Anabaptists, as the sectaries were called, quite as much as the abuses of Romish papalism. The authority of the inner light, the right of

private judgment upon matters of faith, and the priesthood of believers, in the sense of 'each man his own priest,' were no part of the Reformers' teaching. It was not their intention to inaugurate a new dispensation of grace, but to reform and re-invigorate an old one.

The unity of the leaders of reform is best seen in their agreement regarding the paramount and supreme authority of the Scriptures in all matters of faith, morals and discipline, against which or conjointly with which no other authority whether of Church or of tradition or of immediate inspiration could be legitimately placed. They were unanimous in asserting that the Bible alone was of divine origin and inspiration, the very embodiment of God's Word to man, revealing all things 'requisite or necessary to salvation.' Its truth was inerrant and infallible, and its authority self-authenticating, not by virtue of any decree of the Church or of any subjective judgment of man, but by the inward working of the Holy Spirit bearing testimony to its faithful readers and hearers. Whatever things retained in the practice of the Church which were neither expressly enjoined nor prohibited in Scripture were of purely human authority, subject to change with the

needs of the times, though binding upon the conscience in the interest of peaceable order and discipline in the Church.

With these principles of the sole sufficiency of Scripture there appeared a change of method in its use and interpretation, for which the Reformers were indebted to the humanistic New Learning in which they had all been trained. Allegorical and symbolical exegesis was abandoned in favor of a literalistic approach, but a literalism far different from that of the modern critic and student of Holy Writ. The Reformers were, of course, not so simple-minded as to hold to a rigidly mechanical conception of Biblical inspiration. They left room for variations resulting from the frailty of the human medium. Yet they did not consider that the Bible was capable of including contradictions, nor did they eschew the habit of proof-text argument. But their rejection of allegory made their use of proof-texts less arbitrary and fanciful than was the case with medieval schoolmen who generally ignored the context of their citations. The Reformers were so convinced of the unity of Scripture's content that they disdained the sophistry of expounding any passage of the Bible in such a way as to make it contradictory of another. If we deplore today their lack of any sense of historical relativity and evolution in the Scriptural record, we should not be unmindful of the tremendous contribution which they made to Biblical study by their efforts to read the meaning of Scripture out of its text and not into it.¹

¹A good illustration of their method of exegesis is furnished by their treatment of John 6. Both the early Fathers and the medieval theologians, not to say many modern critics, con-

It is understandable therefore that a primary concern of the Reformers was to restore the Bible, whole and entire, and in a language understood by the people, to the corporate offices of the Church's worship. The story of its translation into the vernacular is too familiar to need recounting here. Suffice it to say that there has been a tendency to exaggerate the first-hand knowledge of the Bible among the common people in England on the eve of the Reformation, especially in regard to the discussion of Wyclif's Bible. There is no evidence that large numbers of ordinary men and women possessed copies of it. For one thing its cost was out of reach of most individuals' income; for so long as books were copied by hand they were very expensive. The learned had no need of a vernacular Bible, for they could read the Vulgate or even Erasmus' famous edition of the New Testament in Greek.

The caution of Church leaders in England in meeting demands for a vernacular version is understandable if we remember that the promotion of the cause was associated with heretical influences. If Tyndale had been willing to put forth his New Testament without his Lutheran-inspired glosses and the slanting of many key passages with a view to

sidered that the discourse of our Lord contained in this chapter had direct relevance to the Eucharist, and verses 53-58 were cardinal proof-texts for the doctrine of the Real Presence. But the Reformers all took the chronological order of John literally, and therefore insisted that since this discourse was pronounced before the institution of the Eucharist, it could not have had reference to a rite as yet unknown and unordained. So Luther, *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (trans. A. T. W. Steinhäuser, in *Works of Martin Luther* (Philadelphia, 1915), II, 178-79; Calvin, *Institutes* IV. xvii. 4-5; Cranmer, *Answer to Gardiner* (ed. Parker Soc.), pp. 24-25.

doctrinal controversy, his noble work might very well have received more favorable attention in official circles, and possibly he himself might have been spared a cruel and undeserved martyrdom. Coverdale was far less learned than Tyndale, though equally Protestant in his convictions; but he was less obstinate and stubborn. Hence without material alteration of Tyndale's work, Coverdale succeeded in getting his Bible approved officially, not merely because he had powerful support in men such as Cranmer and Cromwell, but because he was agreeable, even though personally opposed to the idea, to having his version printed without private interpretations.

Nor should we underestimate the rôle played by Cranmer in the struggle for the English Bible. From the time he became archbishop he never wavered in his effort to win King Henry and the bishops over to acceptance of an authorized English version and ultimately to introduce its use into the liturgy of the Church. It is popular and fashionable to play up the vacillations and weaknesses of Cranmer, his lack of consuming zeal, his subservience to the crown, his double-mindedness about so many crucial issues for which he was entrusted with great responsibility. But compromise is often a virtue in a man in high position; and few men in places of critical responsibility have ever had to walk more warily and dangerously than Thomas Cranmer if they were not to wreck entirely the good work which they set themselves to accomplish. Cranmer belongs pre-eminently to those patient souls that "also serve who only stand and wait."

Cranmer's zeal as a reformer was al-

ways tempered by his fastidiousness as a scholar. He was not a man to be rushed into making changes without weighing all sides of the question and pondering their likely results. He believed that experiments should be kept under control, and that, too, under the control of people who had respectable knowledge. And whatever was done must be done decently and in order. His preface to the Great Bible is a model of moderation and common sense, as it is also a glowing testimony to his care for souls. Knowing full well that the Bible was not easy for the simple and unlearned to understand, he advised them to resort to their curate or preacher for help. He was cognizant of the risk involved, considering the temper of the times, in putting the Scriptures into the hands of the people; but he was prepared to take the risk provided the Church gave guidance to its reading through learned and duly authorized teachers. As Dr. H. Maynard Smith has put it, Cranmer followed St. Chrysostom in his counsel to men "to hear sermons and then go home and test the teaching by reference to the Scriptures. The Church was to teach and the Bible to prove."²

But first attempts in introducing the reading of the vernacular Bible in church services did not confirm the hopes and faith of Cranmer. In February, 1542, Convocation ordered that "every Sunday and holy day throughout the year the curate of every parish church after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* shall openly read unto the people one chapter of the New Testament in English without exposition; and when

²*Henry VIII and the Reformation* (Macmillan, 1948), p. 350.

the New Testament was read over then to begin the Old." This direction was very definitely an experiment—suggested no doubt by Luther's proposals made in 1523 in his Latin Mass—except that Luther had called for exposition in connection with the readings. But the bishops, dissatisfied with the Great Bible translation, started work on revising it through joint committees of both houses of Convocation. (Gardiner's list of 99 Latinisms proposed as substitutes for many of the most crucial English words is famous.) The King intervened to stop this meddling. But worse still, the public reading of the Bible in the churches led to such disorder in the services, and such wrangling and disputing both inside and outside the churches that Parliament (inspired doubtless by the King) moved within a year to withdraw the enactment of Convocation. Cranmer bided his time. Five years later King Henry died; and in August, 1547, within the first year of Edward VI's accession, royal injunctions restored the reading of a lesson from the English Bible at Matins and Vespers on Sundays and holy days, and in addition the Epistles and Gospels were to be read in English at high mass.

When the First Prayer Book appeared two years later, Cranmer's preface—which, as is well known, was largely indebted to the preface of Cardinal Quignones' reformed Breviary—devoted two-thirds of its content to the lectionary of the Daily Offices. Two principles stand out conspicuously in this preface. One is that "all the whole Bible (or the greatest part thereof) should be read over once in the year," and the other is that nothing was ordained to be read "but the very pure

word of God, the holy scriptures, or that which is evidently grounded upon the same." Of course, much was made of the fact that this reading was now to be in a language understood by the people, so that they might "continually profit more and more in the knowledge of God, and be the more inflamed with the love of his true religion."

Certain points need to be emphasized with regard to this "godly and decent order of the ancient fathers," as Cranmer called it. One should note the middle course he took between the revision of a Catholic reformer such as Quignones and the more extreme ideas of the Continental Protestant reformers. Quignones had made a drastic reduction in the non-Scriptural lessons, though he did leave provision on festivals for a third lesson from the homilies of the Fathers or the lives of the saints. Cranmer, however, would have none of this. Nothing was to be put upon a par with Scripture. Moreover he eliminated all antiphons, responds, invitations, and such things, lumping them together with the "uncertain stories" which he condemned as having been "planted in" the services to the great disruption of the orderly course of Scriptural readings. Now many of these were Biblical texts: and even Luther retained such in his offices. But Cranmer was after simplicity. Variable pieces associated with the psalmody and lessons are all right for experts—monks and clergy trained over the years in complicated rubrical directions. But they are a nuisance and complication to the laity, and Cranmer was determined to make the Prayer Book a book for all the people, not a breviary for the professionally religious. On the

other hand, Cranmer would not go so far in the Protestant direction as to cut out readings from the Apocrypha. He probably did not foresee the strong attack which the Puritans were to make on this score.

Today we would find the lectionary of the 1549 Book wooden and intolerably literalistic. It made no concessions to the traditional associations of certain books with the seasons of the Christian Year, other than the reservation of Isaiah for Advent and the appointment of proper lessons for a few holy days—twelve to be exact—and three Sundays: Easter, Whitsunday and Trinity. It is too mechanical to go through the Bible chapter by chapter in consecutive order, beginning with Genesis and Matthew in January, and going right straight through, the Old Testament once, the New Testament three times. Similarly with the Psalms, the monthly course took no notice of the day, the season or the hour. Thus, for example, on the feast of the Annunciation, portions of Psalm 119 were read, and the lessons appointed were Joshua 21 and 22, and John 12 and II Timothy 3. Not a one of these propers contained a theme in any way remotely connected with the commemoration of the day. But one exception was made to this routine presentation. The Book of Revelation was entirely omitted from the scheme save for two propers, chapters 1 and 22, appointed for the feast of St. John Evangelist. (Of course, Cranmer considered the evangelist to be the apostle and also the author of the apocalypse.) It has been generally assumed that this slight to the Revelation was another instance of Quignones' influence. But Dr. Bayard H. Jones has made the

more likely suggestion that the use of the Book by "such visionaries as the Anabaptists" did not commend its contents as suitable for reading to the people.³

Every revision of the Prayer Book, beginning with the Elizabethan Book, has modified the overmuch subservience to the civil rather than the ecclesiastical year which Cranmer imposed upon it; indeed, all revisions within the past generation have abandoned altogether the civil year framework. And our latest lectionary in the American Church, approved in 1943, has at long last redistributed the Psalter more sensibly by a skillful combination of course reading with seasonal and timely appointments. We no longer believe that every part of Scripture is of equal value and importance, or even that it is in every instance edifying. Even Cranmer did not think it needful to read all of Leviticus or Numbers. But we have gone him one better by eliminating such unedifying tales as those of Balaam's ass or of the dire fate of Ananias and Sapphira or the statistical information of the Books of Chronicles. It may be questioned, however, whether there was not a great loss in the elimination from the Daily Offices of all readings not contained in Scripture. We need not regret, of course, the excision of the legendary saints' lives. No educated person, Catholic or Protestant, took them seriously in the Reformation era; indeed, there was a proverb current at the time: 'to lie like a second Nocturn.' But the lessons drawn from the homilies and writings of the early Fathers could not be so dismissed; they often con-

³*The American Lectionary* (Morehouse-Gorham Co., 1944), p. 37n.

tained much sound teaching, in some ways more edifying than materials in certain of the Scriptures. Cranmer was a good patristic scholar, and he was given to quoting extensively from the Fathers in theological debate. St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine were particular favorites of his. It is surprising, therefore, that he left no memorial of them and of their works in the liturgy, not so much as a mention of them in the Calendar.

With all due consideration for the uniqueness and superior authority of Scripture, we cannot today hold a conception of Church history which puts the New Testament age on a pedestal above all other periods. Yet such is the implication of Cranmer's treatment of the liturgical Calendar. He left in it only the festivals of our Lord and of the apostles. It is sometimes stated that he did this because he considered these to be the most ancient observances of the Church. Certainly he did not possess our present day knowledge of the history of the Church Year. But he did have a wider acquaintance with liturgical sources than most of his reforming contemporaries — particularly Luther, who made no pretence to being a liturgiologist. No, Cranmer's principle of confining liturgical observances solely to those with a Scriptural reference operated in his reform of the Calendar no less than in his lectionary schemes. He wanted to keep only those holy days for which there was a lesson to be drawn from the Bible. Here he was influenced in large degree by Luther, who, in his Latin Mass, said that in Wittenberg they sought

festivals of all the saints; or if there is any thing worthy in them we think they should be referred to in the Lord's Day preaching. We regard the Festivals of the Purification and of the Annunciation as Festivals of Christ, like the Epiphany and the Circumcision. In place of the Festivals of St. Stephen and of St. John, the Evangelist, it pleases us to use the office of the Nativity. Let the Festivals of the Holy Cross be anathema. Let others act according to their own consciences, or according to the infirmity of others,—whatever the Spirit may suggest.⁴

This last note of tolerance was characteristic of Luther; in the immediate context of this passage he left room for Apostles' Days and Feasts of the Virgin, if any thought them spiritually profitable, provided, however, that the propers were chosen from the Scriptures.

Cranmer thus followed the norm of Scripture for his holy days. But he was not altogether consistent. He left no day especially devoted to our Lord's mother, but only those feasts associated with her which, as Luther said, were really feasts of our Lord. But then why did he omit the Visitation on July 2nd? Perhaps it was because this feast was of recent institution by the papacy, having been promulgated in 1389 by Urban VI. Certainly such reasoning was responsible for his deletion of the Transfiguration, a feast which is not only one of the most ancient commemorations of our Lord, but one of the twelve chief feasts of the Eastern Church. Yet it must have had unpleasant associations in Cranmer's mind; was it not so late as 1457 that the pope made it a universal feast of the Western Church in thanksgiving for a great victory over the Turks? Probably the most curious omission was the commemoration of St. Paul on June 30th,

to celebrate only on Lord's Days and on Festivals of the Lord, abrogating completely the

⁴*Works*, op. cit., VI, 86-87 (trans. by P. Z. Strodach).

immediately after the observance of St. Peter on June 29th. He must have known that the feast of the two chief apostles in close association was one of the primary festivals of the Western Church, even though he may not have known that it was the most ancient of the Apostles' days in the Western Calendar. It is likely that Cranmer decided not to give two days to St. Paul, and being unwilling to drop the Conversion, because of its telling lesson in Scripture, he determined to eliminate the commemoration of the martyrdom. Yet it is an anomaly that our Prayer Book Calendar affords us commemorations of the witness unto death of all the apostles except that of St. Paul. But there is more Scriptural warrant for the martyrdom of St. Paul than for any of the other apostles, with the exception of James the son of Zebedee.

One of the most vexatious problems confronting the Reformers was the matter of ceremonies, for in this Scripture gave little guidance. Cranmer's elaborate note on the subject in his two Prayer Books as to "why some be abolished and some retained" stated principles with which all the leading Reformers would have agreed. They were distressed both at the "great excess and multitude of them," but more particularly with the superstitions surrounding them in the minds of the "rude and unlearned." They did not like what Cranmer called "dark" ceremonies; but they would probably have retained more of them than they did had they not been so fearful of the perils of idolatry and of the conception that ceremonies were matters of conscience and therefore things to be "esteemed equal to God's law." They insisted that ceremonies

were all of human invention, without divine authority, and useful only in so far as they "do serve to a decent order and godly discipline, and such as be apt to stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God."⁸

The difficulty came when the Reformers had to decide which ceremonies were conducive to piety, edification and good order; for here taste no less than principle entered into the picture. Luther, as we know, was more congenial to traditional ceremonials and splendor in worship than most of the Reformers. Cranmer, on the other hand, had no taste for them, and as early as 1536 he cautiously insinuated to the King his ideas on the subject. He was concerned over the popular misconception that such things made men holy and brought remission of sins. Henry, himself not one whit more superstitious than his archbishop, was not inclined to make changes unless political expedencies demanded them or, even more, his cupidity was aroused. After the promulgation of the *Bishops' Book* Cranmer's zeal in suppressing certain time-honored usages or his connivance at those who did almost brought him into disgrace. It is significant that he was not a member of the King's Commission which drew up *The Rationale of Ceremonial*. But in this matter, as in others, Cranmer bided his time. He came very near to persuading the King not long before his death to abolish certain customs, such as the imposition of ashes, the bearing of palms, and the creeping to the cross on Good Friday. But Gardiner intervened, ostensibly with a view towards

⁸Cf. Calvin's *Institutes*, IV. x. 28 for a discussion of St. Paul's maxim about 'decently and in order.'

preventing the ill effect of such measures upon his forthcoming embassy to the Emperor.

It is probably fair to say that the large number of ceremonies retained in the first Prayer Book were not to Cranmer's own personal liking but another example of his capacity for compromise until the opportune time should come for him to have his own way. Most of the criticisms of ceremonial made by Bucer in his review of the Book, everywhere from vestments to the administration of the sacrament in the people's mouths, were taken into account in the second Book. The only two ceremonies that survived were the sign of the cross in Baptism and the ring in marriage, neither of which Bucer had condemned. In both cases the ceremony was accompanied by a formula which carefully explained its significance. Similarly, in the second edition of the Ordinal the traditional delivery of the instruments was changed—the chalice was no longer given to the newly ordained priest or the pastoral staff to the newly consecrated bishop. The delivery of the Bible alone remained, and this was, characteristically, an innovation of Cranmer's.

Especially distasteful to the Reformers was the blessing of things, and not a trace of any such ritual was left in the second Prayer Book. If one examines closely the forms corresponding to the old blessing of the font in the Latin rites one will not find in Cranmer's wording the slightest hint of any blessing or sanctifying of the baptismal water, but only an intercession for the persons to be baptized with it. The use of unction, allowed in the first Book, disappeared in the second. I am inclined

to believe that even in the Holy Communion rite of 1552 Cranmer did not consider his truncated prayer containing the Words of Institution to be a consecration as we understand the term today. When Peter Martyr reviewed the first Prayer Book he took special umbrage at the provision for reservation of the Eucharist for the sick, and insisted that the Communion should be celebrated in the presence of the sick person, "since I consider," he said, "as you also think [the 'you' here is Cranmer] that the words of the Supper belong more to the man than to the bread, or to the wine. . . . And it is really amazing how they dislike saying those words in the presence of the sick man, to whom they are especially profitable, when they are willing to repeat the same [uselessly,] when during communion in the church the wine happens to run short in the cup—since the persons who are present and receive the sacraments have already heard them." Cranmer removed the objectionable reservation from the 1552 Book.

It goes without saying that the doctrine implicit in the Prayer Book formularies was conformed to what the Reformers believed to be a Scriptural norm. That no radical departure from the historic faith of the universal Church as enshrined in the Creeds was made is evident; but the Articles stated bluntly that these Creeds were retained because they "may be proved by the most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." The doctrines rejected by the English Church were those accretions of medieval times which it classed under the name of

¹Quoted in C. Smyth, *Cranmer and the Reformation under Edward VI* (Cambridge University Press, 1926), p. 244.

abuses, i.e., those beliefs which stood in the way of salvation through the sole mediatorship of Christ and of the efficacy of faith in Him alone. Such abuses were specifically: the papal supremacy, the invocation and veneration of the saints, the meritorious character of good works, purgatory, and the propitiatory theory of the Mass, together with the dogma of transubstantiation. In general Cranmer did not use the prayers of the Church, as did many of the Continental Reformers, as a vehicle of doctrinal controversy; but there were polemical intentions in certain phrases of the liturgy, such as "our only Mediator and Advocate" at the close of the prayer for the Church, or the exordium of the Prayer of Consecration, or the words in the final Prayer of Thanksgiving, "heirs through hope . . . by the merits of his most precious death and passion." The Comfortable Words were admitted not only as a devotional source of strength and spiritual peace, but also as a very positive statement of evangelical doctrine.

Certain peculiarities of doctrine stand out, however, in the liturgical formularies, which are perhaps not so faithful to Scriptural teaching—at least by modern criteria of interpretation—as its compilers imagined. The most notable one is that which has to do with the Church's attitude towards the State or civil authority. This is a problem for which there will probably be no definitive solution so long as the present world endures. And the New Testament itself contains various positions on the subject, some of them scattered through our eucharistic proper lessons, for the Christians of the apostolic age took different views about the authorita-

tive claims of the Roman Empire. Our Lord's famous saying, "Render unto Caesar," etc., (which we read in the Gospel for the Twenty-third Sunday after Trinity), was variously interpreted by early Church leaders. It was a broad principle which had to be applied in a variety of concrete historical situations where conflicts of loyalty had to be faced. Only with Constantine did St. Paul's doctrine of Church-State relations become the norm of orthodoxy, and it was to this orthodoxy of Constantine and of Justinian that Henry VIII and Cranmer returned. It is significant that Cranmer introduced the lesson from Romans 13 into the epistolary sequence of Epiphanytide as a bolster for the royal supremacy over the Church; and it is equally revealing to note that the medieval papal Church did not include this lesson in its course readings from the apostle. We sometimes forget that the seeds of contract political theories, as over against divine right theories of kingship, were first sown by the supporters of Hildebrand in the famous struggle of the pope against the Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV.

The establishment of the English Church in the Tudor period rested upon a theory that the sovereign was in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, supreme, and this doctrine was written into the Prayer Book services with unmistakable emphasis. It is easy to understand why this was so. But it is also evident that it has been the occasion of most of the troubles that have dogged the history of Anglicanism ever since the Reformation. It led to the overthrow of episcopacy along with the monarchy at the hands of the theocratically minded Puritans; it produced the

costly schism of the Non-Jurors; and it nearly wrecked the unity of Anglicanism in the American colonies at the time of the American Revolution.⁷

The phraseology of the newer prayers for the State, added in the 1928 American revision, would appear to be not only more realistic but nearer to the mind of the New Testament as a whole. That we should always pray for the civil power in every solemn assembly of the Church for corporate worship is an inalienable part of our tradition and duty from apostolic times. The earliest Christians, face to face at any moment with persecution by the State, never failed to intercede for the Roman Emperor and his magistrates and army, that God would grant them prosperity and peace. Such prayers were in reality pleas to God for the well-being and peace of His Church; or, to put it in Prayer Book phraseology: "that the course of this world may be so peaceably ordered by thy governance, that thy Church may joyfully serve thee in all godly quietness."

One of the great contributions of modern Biblical scholarship has been a recovery of the eschatological flavor of the primitive Gospel, and also of the primitive liturgies. And one of the signal merits of Dom Gregory Dix's recent work, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (West-

minster, 1945), has been its analysis of the way in which the old eschatological connotations of the liturgy lost their primary freshness after the peace of the Church in the fourth century. The liturgy took on an historical rather than a supra-historical caste. It so happened that the Western liturgy was crystallized at just the time when this change of perspective was taking place, and we find in its formularies and usages the two points of view existing side by side. But the medieval Church lost entirely the feeling for the ancient eschatological viewpoint; and the Reformers did not succeed in recovering it for their theological interests lay elsewhere. Some of the ancient phrases remained, such as the *Sursum corda*, and the petition that we might be "filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction." But in the second Prayer Book these eschatological notes became detached from the Consecration Prayer, and in any event they were overshadowed by the predominant memorializing of the past. Even such a fine clause as this was lost—freely adapted by Cranmer from the *Supplices te rogamus* of the Roman Canon:

and command these our prayers and supplications, by the Ministry of thy holy Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the sight of thy divine majesty.

A good place to study this problem is the Collects. Sometimes the Prayer Book has erased altogether the primitive view of the last things as a reality immediately present. This is particularly true of the old Gelasian Collects. The Collect for the Fourth Sunday after Trinity reads in the Latin: "that we so pass through temporal good things that we lose not eternal good things." Here

⁷See the study of W. W. Sweet, "The Role of the Anglicans in the American Revolution," *The Huntington Library Quarterly*, XI (1947), 51-70. An interesting sidelight on the American Church's dilemma is Bishop White's account of the unsuccessful attempt to get into the Prayer Book of 1789 a service commemorating the Fourth of July, which had been part of the Proposed Book of 1786. See his *Memoirs of the Protestant Episcopal Church* (New York, 1880), pp. 117-19. One should also note the ambiguity of the American Church's Article XXXVII: "Of the Civil Magistrates."

the tension between time and eternity is kept in fine balance—the experience of temporal goods is made a sacramental instrument of eternal possessions. But the 1549 insertion of the word “finally” completely alters the sense. Or take the Collect for the Eleventh Sunday. Here, not Cranmer, but the 1662 revisers, made the change. In the Latin it reads: “that we running to thy promises may be made partakers of thy heavenly treasure.” This is very different in spirit, and more in accord with the New Testament, than our present wording, which almost substitutes law for grace: “that we, running the way of thy commandments, may obtain thy gracious promises, and be made partakers of thy heavenly treasure.” The promises and treasure are not free gifts to which we run in haste, but rewards for running the way of the commandments.

Very similar is Cranmer’s change in the Collect for the Thirteenth Sunday after Trinity. For the phrase, “that we may run to thy promises without offense,” he wrote, “that we may so run to thy heavenly promises, that we fail not finally to attain the same.” Here is the word “finally” intruding itself again. One of the most frequently revised Collects is the one for the Twentieth Sunday. The Latin reads: “that we may accomplish with free hearts the things that are thine.” The 1662 revisers substituted “cheerfully” for “free hearts”; our American Book of 1789 changed “the things that are thine” to “those things which thou commandest.” Finally, one might cite the Collect for the Sunday next before Advent. Our Prayer Book version is so different from the original as to become virtually a new

Collect. Compare the Latin: “that they, more readily following after the fruit of (thy) divine working, may obtain from thy goodness larger assistances,” with: “that they, plenteously bringing forth the fruit of good works, may by thee be plenteously rewarded.” The Prayer Book version not only comes closer to Pelagianism—a thing very rare in our liturgy—but it curiously comes nearer to the medieval doctrine of good works than the Reformers’ doctrine of grace.

We get to the heart of Cranmer’s ideals in the new emphases which he put into the rites of the Ordinal, and more especially the vows made in all three ordination services respecting the Holy Scriptures, as containing “all Doctrine required as necessary for eternal salvation.” The Exhortation in the Ordering of Priests—probably Cranmer’s finest single legacy to the Prayer Book—returns again and again to the theme of the importance of the Scriptures both in the daily devotional life of the pastor and in his ministry of teaching and example. The promise of the ordained priest to teach nothing “but that which you shall be persuaded may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures” was, as Parsons and Jones have pointed out, “a distinguishing mark of the Anglican Ordinal” and “of great significance.” For it “lifted the Presbyterate to a new importance, and opened the way to a more thoroughly representative expression of the common faith of all Christian people.” It made the parish parsons no less than the Bishops “the guardians of Christian truth.” Our

⁸E. L. Parsons and B. H. Jones, *The American Prayer Book, Its Origins and Principles* (Scribners, 1937), p. 284.

American Church has extended the responsibility by bringing the laity also, through their representatives in General Convention, into the privilege of guardianship of the faith. For the doctrinal standards of our branch of Anglicanism are subject to the modifications and alterations of General Convention. Thus not just a part of the Church, or even a single organ of its ministry, but the whole Church is accountable. The checks and balances of our polity assure us that there is less likelihood that there

should again arise among us that kind of usurpation of authority and abuses against the truth of God's living and abiding Word, with which the Reformers so valiantly contended. For the restoration of the Scriptures in their purity and integrity to our liturgy and the ready availability of them to all the people, clergy and laity, in a language that they understand, is our surest guarantee of the preservation among us of wholesome, saving, and godly truth and living.

AUTHORITY AND FREEDOM

By A. GABRIEL HEBERT, S.S.M.

Kelham, England

The Page Lecture, delivered at the Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut, on 22 November 1948.

It is usually held that the great strength of the Roman Catholic Church lies in the firm and clear note of authority with which it speaks, amid a multitude of other voices which disagree with one another, and many of which give an uncertain sound. But on the other hand almost all who are not Roman Catholics hold that the Roman claim to authority is the one thing which makes the reunion of all Christians a seeming impossibility; they are sure that it is an essential element in the Christian Faith, and indeed in the constitution of human nature, that man should be free and should accept the responsibility of obeying the truth which he sees.

Thus Authority and Freedom appear

to stand in opposition to one another. With regard to the Bible, there is the question how it can at once be to us the Word of God and be subject to our criticism; how we can at once be humbly obedient to its authority and be free to sit in judgment upon it. But in the wider issue of Authority and Freedom in relation to the Christian Faith itself, the Bible stands at the key point, since it comes to us with authority as the record of God's revelation to man, and as expressing His claim upon man for obedience; and man's obedience must be freely given, because God has made man in His own image, capable of rendering free obedience.

Clearly Authority and Freedom are

both essential. Yet as things are, their rival claims seem to be hopelessly at variance. There is the Roman claim that the official teaching of the Church must be accepted as free from error, and cannot be questioned, being guaranteed by the infallibility of the Pope. There is also the essentially similar claim of Protestant fundamentalism, that the statements of the Bible must all be accepted as free from error, and may not be questioned; in this case, however, since the Bible needs a living voice to interpret it, we get many popes in place of one. On the other side, the claim to Freedom results in a discord of conflicting beliefs and a strife of Denominations.

It is characteristic of the Anglican communion that it should refuse to accept such a dilemma as this, and should seek a middle way. I am indeed almost afraid to use this phrase, a middle way, because it readily suggests the safe and comfortable middle way followed by the respectable and unadventurous who dare not leave the beaten track, or else the easy solution of a conflict between two parties, each of which is contending for a principle of deep importance, by a compromise which does justice to neither. But we have no cause to be ashamed of our Anglican vocation, and the image of the *via media* need not call up any such picture; for it can equally suggest the difficult mountain path lying along a ridge of rock, where the traveller is in continual danger of falling to his ruin down the precipice on one side or the other. To follow such a middle way may demand high courage.

This I believe to be a true image of the Biblical and Christian answer in

this problem of Authority and Freedom. There is a false Authority and a false Freedom, and both notions are widely current; but there is also the Christian paradox expressed by St. Paul who in Romans 8:2 says that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus has set him free from the law of sin and death, having previously in the first words of the Epistle called himself a servant (or rather, slave) of Christ; it is expressed similarly in the Collect at Morning Prayer where we say that God's service is perfect freedom. Or, to take a modern instance, I remember that certain people in England not long before the war were praising the German Confessionals for the grand fight that they were putting up for freedom, in face of the totalitarian claims of Hitler; but Karl Barth protested against this, saying that these Christians in Germany were not standing up for the freedom of the individual, but were under the constraint of the Word of God, and had no choice but to speak and act as they did. Those men were no champions of democracy; but in being subject to God they were free from human tyranny.

This is a very different conception of freedom from the common notion that it means the liberty of the individual to do as he pleases, and be free from constraint, free, for instance, to play golf if he so chooses on a Saturday afternoon. Such a notion of Freedom is implied in the well-known formula of the Four Freedoms: freedom of speech and expression; freedom of every person to worship God in his own way; freedom from want; and freedom from fear—everywhere in the world. That is indeed a noble ideal, particularly in the context in which it originated, when

multitudes in many nations were groaning under the Nazi tyranny. Yet it did not and does not meet the positive ideal which had given strength to the Nazi movement.

For this conception of the right of the individual to do as he pleases involves first the fact that the individual who chooses to please himself is acting under the control of whatever happens to be the strongest impulse at the moment. If he pleases himself, he is not necessarily master of himself; many men are slaves to drink. And secondly, there is a futility and aimlessness in thus living to please oneself; and it was to this that the Nazis appealed. To the German enjoying his petty bourgeois freedom, and hoping as the years went on to improve his spending power, to be able to afford a car, and move out to a comfortable villa in the suburbs, the Nazis brought a call to sacrifice; let a man spend himself in the service of the great German nation, feel the call of the Race and the Blood, and so give and devote his life to a cause greater than himself. Thus Germany became filled with men marching shoulder to shoulder, and feeling that now at last a real meaning and purpose had come into their lives. That which was happening was a voluntary flight from Freedom to Authority.

Here, then, Freedom and Authority are seen as opposites. Freedom is taken to mean the right of the individual to please himself; Authority the subjection of the individual to the control of others. Hence we get a flight from Authority to Freedom, and from Freedom to Authority.

This may be illustrated also from the religious world. There is the claim for

the "freedom of every person to worship God in his own way", as in the text of the Four Freedoms which I have quoted; and we may note that in these words "in his own way" the word "his" is spelt with a small h, not a capital. America and England have had a full dose of this freedom, and both countries are full of religious sects. There has been freedom for every man to interpret the Bible in his own way, and in consequence the Bible has lost the note of religious authority which is proper to it. There has been freedom of Biblical criticism, and the Biblical documents have been interpreted as the books of human writers—as indeed they are, but the authority with which the writers spoke is lost to us. We study the prophets, and set side by side the divergent prophetic versions of the Messianic Hope. But when the various prophecies are thus compared, and the differences duly attributed to the different psychological attitudes of the various prophets and their different circumstances, we appear to be left with a human Messianic Hope, taking a variety of forms, and to be unable to identify any of them with the Promises of God. Were there really any Promises of God? So the New Testament writers certainly believed; but we seem to be unable to say so. Where the New Testament writers and our forefathers believed in a Word of God, we seem to be left with a multitude of words of men.

This is a serious problem, which is widely felt, and is familiar to us all. The result of religious freedom and of freedom to criticize and study the Bible, appears to be that the authority proper to the Bible is lost. It is not surprising, then, that in the religious world also

there appears the phenomenon of a Flight from Freedom to Authority; some join the Roman Church, and some seek to find in our own Church an essentially Roman conception of Authority. They demand to be told what to believe, and to have all their questions answered for them.

It is also possible for a man to separate his thought into compartments, keeping a critical mind in his studies, but leaving his studies altogether on one side when he comes to his devotions. This however is a mere evasion of the problem, which is not good either for his studies or for his life of prayer; and it is a way that in some instances has led to actual disaster. For it involves a running away from truth; there is a truth which is sought in critical studies, and a truth which is sought in the life of faith and of prayer; and these two truths need to be reconciled.

But let us turn to the Biblical and Christian conception of Authority and Freedom, and in the light of it return to criticize the false ways which we have been considering. St. Paul, as we have seen, regarded himself as the slave of God, and yet as having been *set free* from the law of sin and death. Here is the phrase that we need. Christian Freedom is the condition of having been set free, or liberated. It is not a matter merely of the freedom of the will to act as the will chooses; but of the setting free of the man to do the things that he would always have been glad to do, if only he could. He was impotent, the slave of his desires and lusts; now by the grace of God a new power has come to his will, and he is set free, so that he comes to be progressively in control of his life, and able to rule his

desires. It is the task of the Christian pastor, in his dealings with souls, to help them to escape from the hate of impotence and frustration into this true Christian liberty.

In some measure the Nazi found this freedom, when he came out of his aimless and meaningless bourgeois life, and gave himself to the service of his country; but it was only a partial liberation, for he was now under the rule of other men, and forbidden to think thoughts which he knew to be true, at least it was dangerous to give such thoughts expression. But there is no such limitation in the freedom which the Christian finds when he yields himself to the rule of the Lord God; for God is the very truth itself.

The Nazi felt that his life had a meaning and purpose; much more the Christian knows that his life has a meaning, for he is obeying now the purpose for which he was created. And because he is the servant of the Lord God, he is free from servitude to men. "Fear Him, ye saints and you will then have nothing else to fear." Here is an entire freedom, a freedom of the man to be himself, and exercise control over his whole life; and this freedom depends on the surrender of himself to God to whom he belongs. Whenever this final authority is claimed by anything else than God, be it the Pope as the head of the Church system, or the Bible, or the totalitarian state, or some other domineering person, then Freedom is gone and fear takes its place. But where obedience is given to the Lord God, then he is finally free.

In St. John's Gospel (8:31-32) our Lord says: "If ye abide in My Word, then are ye truly My disciples; and ye shall know the Truth, and the Truth

shall make you free." The Jews object that as children of Abraham, they do not need to be made free. He replies (vs. 34) that every one who sins is the slave of sin; but (vs. 36) "if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed." Later in the same gospel we are shown how He who thus sets men free is their true King; not indeed as a political Messiah, holding temporal power, for His Kingdom is not of this world, and therefore, He has no army or police; His servants do not fight, to save Him from being delivered to the Jews (18:36). Yet he has come to be King, and King He is: "To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world, that I should bear witness unto the Truth. Everyone that is of the Truth heareth My voice" (18:37). In the next chapter we shall see Him so designated: "Behold, your King" (19:14), at the moment when the Jews insist that He must be crucified. But the royalty which consists in bearing witness to the Truth suffers no sort of derogation by His shameful crucifixion; on the contrary, His glory is there supremely manifested. He, when He is lifted up from the earth, draws all men unto Himself (12:32); and when He is crucified, it is with the title over His head, "Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews," written in the three languages which mattered in the ancient world, in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin (19:19-20).

Here is the consummation of the saving purpose of God for mankind, of which the Bible is the record. The Bible is the Book of the Divine Kingdom; that Kingdom which the Lord God took in hand to establish when He chose one nation to be His peculiar people, that

Israel might learn to know Him and the way of His spiritual service. The prophets of Israel announced in His Name the future consummation of His Kingdom in the Messianic Age; and Jesus, when He appeared, began His ministry with the announcement that "the time is fully come and the Kingdom (kingly rule) of God has drawn near; repent and believe the Glad News" (Mark 1:15). In the Church of Jesus the Messiah, that which had hitherto been the privilege of one nation is extended to all nations; and the Church exists on earth in order that in it and through its witness Christ may reign over men. That is what the Church is for. In it men hear the Gospel of redemption, deliverance, liberation, freedom from the dominion over them of Satan and sin, by their acceptance of the kingly rule of God and of His Christ; and this redemption and liberation has been effected by the mighty acts of God in history, and the present gift of the Holy Ghost.

Such is the work of God for man's salvation effected in the Sacred History; and the method of His operation throughout has been to reveal Himself in and through human nature. God has not revealed Himself by sending celesteal airplanes to write messages in the sky, like the sky-writing which appears from time to time above New York, but always by means of weak and frail human nature. He did His mighty acts, in redeeming Israel from Egypt and making His Covenant with it; and He sent at the same time Moses, whom the Old Testament regards as the greatest of the prophets (Deut. 34:10) to explain what He was doing. Of His mighty acts both under the Old Covenant and the

New, men were sent to be the witnesses and interpreters to their fellow-men. For this purpose it was not necessary that they should be infallible, but only that they should be faithful witnesses of what they had seen and of what they had learnt to understand. I would lay stress on this word "witness," a very important word in the New Testament and especially in St. John. Of John the Baptist, the typical representative of prophecy, it is there said; "There was a man, sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. That was the true Light, which lighteneth every man that cometh into the world" (John 1:6-9).

Here, then, we have the key to the authority of the Bible. The Biblical writers are men, of one flesh and blood with us, sharing the limitations which are proper to human nature. Therefore in studying their writings, we need to employ all the resources of expert historical and literary investigation. But we completely fail to understand what they are saying if we do not at the same time keep our minds open to hear the Divine word which they were labouring to express. A criticism which studies the books only from the point of view of archaeology or of comparative religion, or of literary criticism, thereby debars itself from understanding just those things which the writers were most concerned to say. On the other hand a Fundamentalism which refuses to accept the fact that God spoke His word through weak and frail man thereby shuts out the light which

critical study throws on the human agents and their work, and falls into that fatal error which in the Christological sphere appears as Monophysitism, the denial of the true humanity of our Lord, and the assertion that His human nature is swallowed up in His divinity.

The books of the Bible, then, bear authoritative testimony to the redemptive acts of God in history; primarily, that is, to the events of the first redemption in the Exodus and of the second redemption in the Incarnation, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. They appeal to history and that appeal must be carried through. We need to know that we can truly say, "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for He hath visited and redeemed His People"; and indeed the thorough and expert examination of the records, by the best means of historical investigation, is the only way we have of proving that the crucial narratives of the resurrection of our Lord are the honest testimony of reliable witnesses, and not a fabrication of legend.

This is the appeal which St. Paul makes in I Cor. 15. He first quotes the official testimony to the Resurrection, which he had received from the original apostles; and then he says that if Christ is not risen, the Christian preaching is vain and "your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins" (vv. 14, 17). His argument is: If Jesus who was rejected by the Jews as a false claimant to Messiahship and was crucified, was not vindicated by God in the Resurrection, then Caiaphas had, and has, the last word; the New Covenant prophesied by Jeremiah, which was to bring forgiveness of sins (Jer. 31:31-34),

has in that case not been given; in that case the Messiah has not come, and there has been no redemption. Further, he says, we apostles "are found false witnesses of God, because we witnessed of God that He raised up Christ" (vs. 15). His appeal, then, is to facts of history, of which the Apostles are witnesses; and the appeal must still be to those same facts, as attested by the records.

The same appeal to history must be carried through in the investigation of the records of the Exodus of Israel from Egypt. This is a problem which it is not possible to discuss in this lecture. It is clear that very much must be left undetermined; the narratives date from at least four centuries after the event. Yet behind the narratives lies a much older tradition, attested for instance by the ancient song of Miriam in Exodus 15, and by allusions to it in early narratives (such as Judges 6:13), by institutions such as the Passover and the Sacred Ark, and not least by the fact that the resulting faith of Israel was different in kind from the religious beliefs of the neighbouring tribes.

But the very fact that much must be left undetermined brings to light one important point; that what is at stake is the substantial historicity of the event, not that the narrations should be proved to be free from error in every detail. The inerrancy of the narratives cannot be proved; indeed it can be disproved. The scholars cannot maintain that the narrative of the Crossing of the Red Sea, for instance, is accurate in every detail; and he is safe in attributing the conflicting details to different sources which have been combined in the pres-

ent narrative. Similarly with regard to the Resurrection of our Lord, he must face the fact that in the narratives of the visit of the women to the tomb on Easter morning, they are variously recorded to have seen the Angel of the Lord, one young man, and two men (Matt. 28:2-5, Mark 16: 5-7, Luke 24:4-7). But the thing that matters is the fact of the Empty Tomb itself. Our faith is in God and in what He has done. We must accept with both hands this honest appeal to history, and not be guilty of the foolishness of saying to ourselves that we cannot be certain of any historical event in the past. None of us doubts that the British were turned out of America and the independence of the United States was declared a hundred and seventy years ago, even though there may well be uncertainty about a number of details in the history.

Secondly, the authority of the Bible means that the Bible teaching about God and the way of His spiritual service is accepted by us as authoritative. This teaching reaches its climax and supreme expression in the person and teaching of our Lord, who is declared to be *the Word of God made flesh, the final revelation in human flesh and blood of the love and truth of God, so that He is the pattern of true human nature.* There is, besides, the apostolic teaching in the New Testament, and the preparatory teaching of the Old Testament. To the authority of the Scriptures of both Testaments we submit ourselves when in the church service we pray and praise God in the words of the psalms, and read the lessons for our instruction and edification.

But how can the Old Testament, in

particular, be authoritative, when the New Testament confesses it to be imperfect? Throughout the Old Testament period the people of Israel were being trained up in the way of faith, and the worship of God, and His service in daily life; they were set to learn and to record for our benefit the elementary truths about these things. Those who wrote the books were themselves pupils in the divine school, engaged in learning and expressing these necessary things.

That being so, it is plain that the writers are not "infallible." Frequently, the writers say quite different things; they do not agree with one another. Further the morals of the Old Testament are the subject of much adverse comment in these days; do they not show, for instance, a bloodthirsty ferocity when the wholesale extermination of Amalek is ordered in the Name of the Lord (I Sam. 15:3)?

Here is another large question with which it is impossible to deal in detail here. But this may usefully be said. There is an important distinction to be drawn between (on the one hand) differences of cultural level, and (on the other) the fundamental response which the human person must make to the personal God. The early Israelites stood on quite a low cultural level; they fought against their enemies with ferocity and behaved to them with a cruelty which, however, may be paralleled in the cruelty which quite nice boys will sometimes show towards animals and especially towards one another. But when it comes to the fundamental response of the human soul to God, to the fundamental human relation of a man to his wife, or the attitude of man in face of suffering and death, the cul-

tural differences seem to drop away, and men are seen as souls in God's presence, in whose sight many that are first are last and the last first. Perhaps one of the most fundamental points of all is the question whether a king or a priest thinks of the religion of the people primarily as a means whereby his own power over them is maintained, and so is prepared to make gain out of their superstitious fears; or whether he takes God seriously, and fears God, believing that both he and the people are answerable to Him. The morals of King David were plainly very imperfect; but the fact that he confessed that he sinned against the Lord in the matter of Bathsheba and Uriah the Hittite seems to show that he understood this point (II Sam. 12:13.)

In regard to these fundamental things, above all to the reality of God and His claim upon man, we are safe with the Old Testament. The writers are imperfect; but they are grappling with the truth of God and His dealings with men, seeking to learn what is His will and His way for man. We do well if we humbly listen to them, and try to see what it was that they saw and sought to express; and that is to accept their authority. But just at this point many scholars and students of the Bible are gravely at fault, because they are interested only in the cultural development; consequently they find much to criticise, while at the same time they fail to learn the things that the writers were really concerned to say.

Thus our attitude to the Bible must be at once critical and docile, alert and humble. We must not shrink from a paradox such as this, but be prepared to accept it with both hands. Such is

always the right human attitude to authority, as of boys to their schoolmaster, of the congregation to their priest, of the clergy to their bishop. Those in authority, if they understand their office rightly, do not desire in their subordinates an unquestioning docility; they want to be leaders of men who are real men and therefore are alert and critical.

Hence, we do very wrong if we accept the dilemma which Fundamentalism, both Catholic and Protestant, seeks to impose upon us, and say that if we accept the authority either of Church or Bible we must accept it unquestioningly. That dilemma rests on the false doctrine of Authority and Freedom which we have rejected; either we are free to do and think what we like, or we are subject to infallible and coercive authority. But we have seen that the acceptance of God's authority over us is that which sets us free. We have seen also that a clear distinction must be drawn between Divine and human authority; and this distinction is of quite cardinal importance. It is to God, who is the Truth, that final authority belongs; men who exercise authority do so in His Name, and their authority is always subordinate and derivative. They are not the Light, but are sent to bear witness to the Light. They do not possess truth in themselves; they are sent to bear witness to those things which they have seen and known.

When therefore the German Nazis accepted the state, and Hitler as the head of the State, to be the final authority over their whole lives, they were denying their birthright as men. They had had fled from the false conception of Freedom straight to the false conception of Authority. Nazism was in

fact, a false Messianism, deifying Hitler, and thereby worshiping an idol in the place of God.

With regard to Fundamentalism both Catholic and Protestant, the notion of infallibility itself is a real disaster. The true place both of the Bible and of the officers of the Church is that they are the appointed witnesses to God and to His truth. But the error of the idea of infallibility is that the teaching which is formulated by men is identified with the divine truth itself. We have seen how impossible the task of the interpreter of the Bible becomes, if he is required to show that the story of the crossing of the Red Sea is exactly true in every detail, and how the same problem arises over the narratives of the Resurrection; but that it is the fact of the Empty Tomb itself that matters, and of the Resurrection of the Lord which it attests. What was demanded of the Apostles was that they should bear faithful testimony to the fact of the Resurrection and to the Christ risen victorious from the dead; it is sufficient that their testimony should be "substantially true."

It is a matter of faithful witness to God's saving work, not merely of a correctly formulated doctrine to which the mind assents. Faith, in the Biblical sense of the word, is always more than an intellectual assent to propositions. Faith in God is more than the belief that God exists; even though I must hold that God exists if I am to have faith in Him (for "he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him," Heb. 11:6), just as I need to have a correct belief that the train into which I am getting is the right train

which will take me where I want to go. But Faith in God expresses the personal relation of a man to the personal God, and involves a self-committal to Him, just as when I get into the train I commit myself to it and to the care of the engineer and the signalmen.

The unfortunate thing about this notion of infallibility is that it involves the false equation of faith with the assent of the mind to formulated doctrines. At the same time there is in it a vital truth, which however it misrepresents and perverts, namely, that of faithful witness to the personal God and His saving work. If the day comes when the office of the Pope comes to be so understood as meaning not the infallible guarantee of correctly defined doctrines but rather of faithful witness to the living God and His Gospel, that will be a blessing beyond price for the Church and for the world.

The question of Authority and Freedom is one that lies very near to the heart of the problem of Christian Unity.

The Christian Gospel is the Gospel of the Divine Kingdom, of the kingly rule of Christ over men, for the sake of which the Church exists. It is not sufficient, therefore, that doctrinal agreement should be secured between the different denominations, as though it were merely a matter of reconciling divergent human opinions; for Christian doctrine is concerned with the work of God for man's salvation, and therefore with a truth which comes to us with authority. Still less is it tolerable that the denominations should be amalgamated without any serious consideration of the doctrinal questions involved. It is not a matter of agreements being made, whether doctrinal or administrative, to limit human freedom to differ and secure cooperation; for the Church is concerned with God's truth and God's saving action. The United Church of the future will not appeal for men's cooperation; it will come to them with authority, speaking to them in Christ's Name, and calling them to share in that unity by which He has made them one.

CRITERIA FOR THE ESOTERIC LOGIA IN MARK

By OSCAR J. F. SEITZ

Bexley Hall, Kenyon College

Although a good deal has been written concerning the familiar Marcan device of secrecy on the part of Jesus with regard to his messiahship, so far as the present writer is aware little study has been devoted to Mark's attempts to portray Jesus as having on several occasions given esoteric instruction to a select group of hearers.¹ Yet it is notable that while the subject matter of such confidential discourses is in many respects quite heterogeneous, the form of the various passages in question tends to follow a common, somewhat stereotyped pattern. Jesus is first represented as making some pronouncement to what may properly be termed a public audience: a crowd (Mk. 4:1, 7:14, cf. 9:14f), the Pharisees or some of their scribes (7:1, 9:14, 10:2) or various others (11:27-12:38f). Later, after withdrawal and in response to private questioning by disciples, Jesus is pictured as giving further instruction, usually on the same subject. The instruction thus given is, therefore, concealed from the wider audience and revealed only to a chosen few (Mk. 4:10ff, 34, 7:17ff, 9:28ff, 10:10ff, 13:3ff).

In most of the instances of this kind certain key words or phrases tend to recur in the editorial introduction to the supposedly esoteric logion. These include the repeated statement, "and when he had entered [the] house . . . his disciples asked him . . .," *et cetera*, sometimes expanded by the further as-

sertion that the interrogation was done "privately" (κατ' ιδίαν) or when Jesus was alone (κατὰ μόνας).² Perhaps the most complete formula in this respect is found in Mark 9:28, which reads:

καὶ εἰσελθόντος αὐτοῦ εἰς οἶκον οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ κατ' ιδίαν ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν . . . , καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς.³

Somewhat briefer formulae appear in other passages:

ch. 4:10 Καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο κατὰ μόνας ἡρώτων . . . τὰς παραβολὰς . . . καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς.⁴

ch. 7:17 καὶ ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν εἰς οἶκον ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ τὴν παραβολὴν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς.

ch. 10:10 καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν οἱ μαθηταὶ περὶ τούτου ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς.⁵

ch. 13:3 καὶ καθημένου αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν κατέναντι τοῦ ἱεροῦ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν κατ' ιδίαν Πέτρος καὶ Ἰάκωβος καὶ Ἰωάννης καὶ Ἀνδρέας.

In this last instance the select trio of ch. 9:2 and elsewhere is enlarged to a quartet. In ch. 4:10 the questioners are described in most MMS as οἱ περὶ αὐτὸν σὺν τοῖς δώδεκα, the more usual οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ being read by DΘΦ lat syr^{sin}.

That such formulae are a device invented by the evangelist in the interest of this own theory that Jesus concealed certain elements in his teaching from the general populace and disclosed them only to a favored inner circle of companions appears fairly likely. As literary conventionalities they have much in

common with the repeated conclusion to the five great Matthean compilations of sayings: καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τοὺς λόγους τούτους, or some modification of that (Mt. 7:28, 11:1, 13:53, 19:1, 26:1). Interestingly enough two of these Matthean collections reproduce Marcan material in which the esoteric device appears and in each case the Marcan formula is taken over (Mt. 13:36, 24:3).⁶ Moreover, with the exception of Mt. 13:2ff, the group addressed throughout each of these discourses is always the disciples (Mt. 5:1f, 10:5, 17:25, 18:1f, 21ff).

A strong probability that, by the adoption of this device which represents Jesus as delivering esoteric doctrines to his disciples, Mark introduced an unhistorical element into the evangelic tradition is suggested by several important considerations. Perhaps the clearest evidence that this is the case is found in Mark 4:1f, 10ff, 33ff. At the beginning of this section Jesus is described as sitting in a moored boat and telling a single parable to a crowd of people gathered on the sea-shore. At the conclusion of the parable the evangelist makes this statement:

"And when Jesus was alone those who were about him with the twelve asked him concerning the parables, and he said to them, 'To you has been given the secret of the kingdom of God but to those outside everything is in parables.'"—Mark 4:10f.⁷

The repeated use of the plural, "parables", in these two verses is exceedingly interesting, since Jesus has so far told but one parable, which, however, it is hinted in vs. 13, is the key to understanding "all the parables".⁸ It is in response to this private inquiry of the disciples that Jesus is represented as

explaining the allegorical meaning of the four kinds of soil referred to in the story. Enough has been written by others concerning the clumsiness of the interpretation as given in verses 15, 16, 18 and 20, to establish it as almost certainly secondary and not an original part of the tradition. The point here to be noted is that after this interpretation is given the evangelist continues to portray Jesus as going on to tell several further parables, presumably still speaking to the crowd on the shore, since the writer concludes with the sweeping generalization:

"With many such parables he spoke the word to them as they were able to hear it; he did not speak to them without a parable, but privately to his own disciples he explained everything".—Mark 4:33f.

Thus it appears likely that Mark had access to a little collection of parables (vv. 2-9, 21-32) into which he deliberately introduced, in vv. 10-20 and 33-34, his own theory of a secret teaching reserved only for the initiated.

Although it is true that the subject matter of the esoteric logia in Mark is, as already noted, in some respects quite dissimilar, in at least three instances the device of a private interview between Jesus and a group of disciples is employed in connection with material highly germane to the Marcan theory of a messianic secret. Thus the parables in ch. 4 have for their subject, according to Mark, the "mystery" of the kingdom of God (vs. 11, cf. 22, 26, 30); the withdrawal in ch. 9:2ff leads to the transfiguration, which not only furnishes divine confirmation to the disciples' confession of Jesus as Messiah but provides occasion for further predictions of his passion and resurrection (vv. 9,

12);⁹ the entire discourse in ch. 13 deals with the signs of his coming as the Son of Man. But the connections between these passages may have been even closer. Not only have there been conjectures that the incident of the transfiguration may incorporate what was originally the report of a resurrection appearance of Jesus, but the suggestion was made recently to this writer by Dr. Philip Carrington, Anglican Archbishop of Quebec, that the "secret" about the seed in the parables of ch. 4 may at one time have referred to the necessity of the Messiah's death and resurrection, as in Jn. 12:24 (cf. 1 Cor. 15:36f.) If this were so, the rather awkward "explanation" of the parable now standing in vv. 13-20 would perhaps be due to the final editor of the Gospel, rather than to the evangelist himself.

Not only has Mark 13 long been regarded as a compilation of originally isolated sayings of Jesus, the present sequence of which is probably due to the evangelist or to some source used by him, but the author of the passage has even been suspected of having incorporated a relatively small number of authentic sayings into the already existing framework of a little apocalypse. While it is not impossible that this short work may have been a purely Jewish document, if it were the utterance of some Christian prophet speaking or writing in the Spirit, the compiler might reasonably have regarded it as in some sense a revelation given by the Lord himself. The esoteric device in vs. 3, which represents the discourse as a response to private inquiry by an inner circle of disciples, suggests that the evangelist may have been conscious that here was material which should in

some way be set apart from traditional public utterances of Jesus and marked as teaching which had originated in the bosom of the Christian church, of which those disciples are to be taken as the representatives.

Likewise unhistoric appears the sweeping conclusion reached by the evangelist in ch. 7:17. At the beginning of this section Jesus is represented as engaged in controversy with some Pharisees over the fact that his disciples have on some unreported occasion eaten with unwashed hands.¹⁰ What Jesus has to say on this subject is at first made more fully "public" by the statement in vs. 14, that Jesus "called the crowd to him again" before uttering the important saying, "There is nothing outside a man which by going into him can defile him, but the things which come out of a man, these defile him." But, the narrator continues, "when he had entered the house and left the people, his disciples asked him about the parable" (*sic*). Only then does Jesus utter the statement by which, according to Mark, "he declared all foods clean" (vv. 17ff). No doubt in retrospect that is the way the church which this evangelist represents had come to interpret the mind of Christ. Indeed, the fact that it is the disciples, rather than Jesus himself, whom the Pharisees criticize in vv. 2ff, suggests that we have here, as perhaps in the similar criticism over the non-observance of the Sabbath in ch. 2:23ff, some reminiscence of controversies which had disturbed the church of the evangelist's own day. Certainly if the record of Acts 10 means anything it is that the normal Jewish attitude toward non-kosher food was so deeply ingrained among the first disciples of Jesus that

it required some kind of special revelation to convince Peter that he might eat with Gentiles at their own tables or even hold intimate converse with them without the risk of defilement. Thus it appears fairly certain that during his life-time Jesus had taught his disciples nothing which they then understood as declaring "all foods clean". Thus, too, as in the instances already discussed, not merely the esoteric device itself but the matter introduced by it is open to serious question.

A somewhat analogous situation exists with regard to the esoteric logion in Mark 10:10-12. Here again, just as in ch. 7:1-13, Jesus is first pictured as involved in public controversy with certain Pharisees. The truly public nature of the discussion is emphasized by the fact that, in vs. 1, Jesus is represented as teaching the crowds and that it is while he is thus engaged the Pharisees approach him with the question, "Is it lawful for a man to divorce his wife?"¹ In the conversation which follows, Jesus states simply the ideal of marriage as a life-long union (vv. 6-9). Then as on several other occasions, including the instance in ch. 7:17, Jesus and the disciples withdraw from the crowd, the evangelist going on to relate:

"And in the house the disciples asked him again about this matter. And he said to them, 'Whoever divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery against her; and if she divorces her husband and marries another, she commits adultery.'—Mark 10:10-12.

Here the two sentences in vv. 11 and 12 form a neatly balanced parallel. However, the second half of this logion is strongly suspected of having originated after the church had become established on Gentile soil where a wife had a legal

right to divorce her husband. Under Jewish law as prescribed in Deut. 24:1-4, the initiative in divorce proceedings rested solely with the husband and, while under certain circumstances a wife could petition the court to require her husband to give her a writ of divorce-ment, it would be entirely inaccurate to describe this process in the words of Mark 10:12, whereas they are quite appropriate as a description of what a woman might do under Roman law.

Moreover, it is not merely the second but likewise the first half of this esoteric logion which is highly dubitable. Nor is this a question simply of the accuracy of the phrase *μοιχάται ἐπ' αὐτήν*. It involves rather the whole notion that remarriage after divorce constitutes an act of adultery. Did Jesus actually teach this? No doubt by the time our evangelist wrote, the church for which he spoke had come to such a conclusion. However, we have in the New Testament documentary evidence at least a decade and a half earlier which seems to point in the opposite direction. Writing to the church at Corinth, Paul had asserted:

"To the married I give charge, not I but the Lord, that the wife should not separate from her husband (but if she does let her remain single, or else be reconciled to her husband) and that the husband should not divorce his wife."
—1 Cor. 7:10f.

It is, of course, possible that Paul had in mind here some saying of Jesus similar in content to the words recorded in Mark 10:6-9, a saying which, however, he was apparently unable to quote verbatim, or else chose not to do so, lest it be inferred that such words were to be regarded as a new law binding upon Christians, an idea quite foreign to

Paul's conception of the new life of the Spirit. Another possibility occasionally suggested is that the words, "not I but the Lord," may refer to what Paul believed was a special revelation to himself. In either case, however, the net result of the evidence is the same; there is no indication that Paul had ever heard of a dominical saying which branded remarriage after divorce as an act no different from adultery, an idea not even hinted in his argument in this chapter.¹² Thus, even if on other grounds we could accept the Marcan device of esoteric logia as historical, it is scarcely conceivable that the "disciples" should have kept the teaching of Mark 10:10-12 secret even from fellow-believers, of whom Paul was one, for nearly a generation.

In one instance after another we are led to the conclusion that the series of esoteric logia really is a device which may have been adopted by our earliest evangelist as a means of separating from the traditionally attested sayings of Jesus certain interpretations of his teaching which had arisen in the church of which Mark was the representative. Such a generalization is not invalidated by the apparent fact that the motives for the alleged secrecy are not equally obvious every case. For example, Mark 9:28f represents Jesus as revealing to his disciples, not to the crowd mentioned in vs. 14, that a certain kind or genus of evil spirit "cannot be driven out by anything but prayer." Even here the fact that the disciples themselves had first attempted to exorcise the demon without effect, and after Jesus succeeded ask him privately the reason for their own failure, suggests the later concern of the church over the question why

Christian exorcists were not always successful.¹³

There are still other instances of the phrase *κατ' ἰδίαν*, in Mark 6:31:32 and 7:33, where the esoteric motive may appear even less clear to us. However, the former introduces the account of the feeding of the five thousand, which in Mark only less explicitly than in the Fourth Gospel is "eucharistic" in character (Mk. 6:41, cf. 8:46) and might therefore have suggested to the evangelist a secret belonging only to the church, even though in the actual narrative the company sharing this meal is not confined to those described as "disciples". And if the meal itself had acquired a messianic or eschatological reference, as suggested by 1 Cor. 11:26, John 6:14-15 (cf. Mark 14:25), then the secrecy in Mark becomes all the more understandable. As for the latter instance cited above (Mk. 7:33), it is noteworthy that the formula of privacy introduces the report of a cure in which the evangelist repeats the exact Aramaic word, *ephphatha*, uttered by Jesus to effect the restoration of speech and hearing. The situation, therefore, resembles very closely the case in Mark 5:41, where Jesus, having first ejected the crowds gives voice to the efficacious formula, *talitha cumi*, only in the elect company of the child's parents and an inner circle of three disciples (vv. 37, 40).¹⁴

Turning now to the other Synoptists, a situation somewhat parallel to those last cited from Mark is created in Matthew 9:28, where, after being publicly hailed by two blind men as Son of David (as in Mark 10:47f), Jesus "entered the house" in which place of privacy he first questions the blind men

regarding their faith and after the cure charges them to keep secret—what is it? the fact or manner of the cure? or their belief in his messiahship as implied by the title with which they had addressed him? Beside this device of “the house,” already familiar to us in Mark, which becomes the setting for a private explanation of a parable in Matthew 13:36 (cf. Mark 4:10, 34) and also of what appears to be a miracle in Matthew 17:25f, Matthew reproduces from Mark the phrase κατ’ ἰδίαν in four instances (Mt. 14:13, 17:1, 19, 24:3) and adds a further instance of his own to introduce a prediction of the passion of the Messiah in ch. 20:17ff (cf. Mark 9:2, 9f). On the other hand Matthew eliminates the esoteric device where it is found in Mark 4:34 and 10:10 and modifies what is found in Mark 4:10 and 7:17 to such an extent that the explanations given to the disciples may be understood as spoken in the hearing of the crowd (see Matthew 13:10, 15:15).

Luke’s treatment of the whole scheme of private instruction in the passages here under discussion is far more drastic. He omits all but one of the occurrences of κατ’ ἰδίαν as found in Mark, and even there (Luke 9:10) makes the withdrawal of Jesus and his disciples, not to some remote, uninhabited region, as in Mark 6:32, but “to a city called

Bethsaida” a statement which creates some confusion since in vs. 12, exactly as in Mark, the disciples describe the place as ἔρημος. In Mark 6:45 Bethsaida is on the other side of the lake from the place of the feeding (cf. Mark 8:22). Beside this instance, there is a second occurrence of the phrase κατ’ ἰδίαν, without Marcan parallel, in Luke 10:23 where it forms part of the introduction to a logion not so introduced in Matthew 13:16-17.³ Moreover, Luke has omitted two entire episodes where the esoteric device occurs in Mark, namely, the controversies over eating with unwashed hands and over divorce (Mk. 7:1-23, 10:1-12). In the latter case, Luke reproduces the logion of vv. 11-12 in slightly modified form in ch. 16:18. Thus Matthew seems to accept the esoteric device of Mark, although reproducing it only in part, whereas Luke appears to reject or at least to ignore it almost completely. There is nothing to suggest that this device appeared in other sources known to the later evangelists. It appears altogether reasonable to conclude from the evidence that the whole scheme of esoteric logia is the invention of Mark himself, the product not of an historical reporting of events, but rather of subsequent reflection upon and speculation about those events.

FOOTNOTES

¹For a brief but highly suggestive discussion, see H. J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, p. 80; also M. Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, pp. 220f, 227ff.

²While it is usually the disciples who make private inquiry of Jesus, in one instance (ch. 9:33) this pattern is reversed.

³Cf. vs. 2 of the same chapter for similar emphasis on the completeness of the withdrawal before the transfiguration: καὶ ἀναφέρει αὐτοὺς εἰς ὄρος ὑψηλὸν κατ’ ἰδίαν μόνους.

⁴Cf. vs. 34: κατ’ ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς ἰδίοις μαθηταῖς ἐπέλυσεν πάντα.

⁵Beside the instances listed here, somewhat similar intention of retirement to a house is found in ch. 2:1, cf. 15, 3:19b, 7:24.

⁶On the use of Mark’s κατ’ ἰδίαν by the other Synoptists more will be said at the conclusion of this article.

⁷New Testament quotations in English are from the Revised Standard Version of 1946.

⁹Equally interesting is the use of the terms τὸ μυστήριον and οἱ ἔξω, the latter in contrast to the disciples, suggesting that the followers of Jesus already constitute an ἐκκλησία separate from the rest of Judaism. Cf. Paul's use of the phrase οἱ ἔξω in I Cor. 5:12, Col. 4:5, I Thess. 4:12.

¹⁰Cf. also ch. 9:30ff where it is said that Jesus did not want anyone to know that he was passing through Galilee "because he was teaching his disciples."

¹¹Did the evangelist perhaps suppose this to have taken place at the meal with the multitude which he has narrated in the preceding chapter?

¹²As it stands this question appears to be purely rhetorical. It is made somewhat more plausible in Matthew 19:3 by the addition of the qualifying phrase κατὰ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν. In answer to this wholly different inquiry, the logion in Mt. 19:9, no longer uttered in private to disciples only, is likewise modified by the well-known Matthean exception μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ (cf. Mt. 5:32), which simply places Jesus in agreement with the opinion of the school of Shammai on the subject of grounds for divorce.

¹³While this is not the place to go into the Pauline exception stated in vs. 15, or into the effect of Paul's interim ethic in vv. 17-24, 29-31, upon the advice given about marriage, no true interpretation of Paul's teaching on this subject can be obtained if the eschatological context is ignored.

¹⁴While it is not necessary to find in the references to the οἶκος or οἰκία in 7:17, 9:28, 10:10 an allusion to the Christian meeting place, even this is not impossible.

¹⁵In the abbreviated wording of Mt. 9:25, Jesus appears to go in to the child alone and unattended; Lk. 8:53, on the other hand, omitting the dismissal of the crowd, makes the cure a public one. However, neither of the later Synoptists repeats the Aramaic formula, Luke giving the translation, Matthew omitting the words entirely.

¹⁶The only other occurrences of κατ' ἰδίαν in the New Testament beside those already discussed in this article are Acts 23:9, Gal. 2:2. There is also one further instance of κατὰ μόνας in Lk. 9:18, which is in some respects a parallel to Mark 9:2. so far as the language is concerned.

PRIESTHOOD AND REUNION

By LOUIS A. HASELMAYER

Cathedral School, Dallas

The most controversial element in reunion discussions between Churches of the Anglican Communion and non-conformist bodies is the ministry. The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral has, even in its most weakened form (Lambeth, 1920,¹) insisted that the historic episcopate is an essential in any united church. But the schematic arrangement of the Quadrilateral has had two unfortunate results. It has divorced the episcopate from the whole of the sacred ministry with the result that most reunion schemes omit any reference to the priesthood. It has divorced the ministry from the organic tradition of the Faith of the Church with the re-

sult that Faith and Order become distinct and not organic elements. It has been as a protest against such a divorce that some recent Anglican books have been written.²

Certain recent non-conformist books on the ministry,³ and many of the reunion-schemes, show a growing willingness to accept some kind of constitutional episcopacy. There is even a willingness to accept episcopal ordination as a general rule, provided it is no more than of the *bene esse* of the Church. This provision is designed to exclude any suggestion of the doctrine of Apostolic Succession as essential to the fullness of the ministry.

As Anglicans we must regard this as a hopeful step in the growing understanding of our tradition. But it is episcopacy as a governmental means of unity on the horizontal plane, and episcopacy as a symbol of continuity on the vertical plane that has commended itself to many. This much is evident from a leading non-conformist of the Church of South India, Bishop J. E. Lesslie Newbigin in *The Reunion of the Church* (S.C.M. Press, London, 1948); and from a Methodist leader of the Ceylon Scheme of Union, Mr. D. T. Niles in *The Temple of Christ in Ceylon* (Methodist Missionary Society, London, 1948). What is lacking in both of these discussions is any willingness to see in the unity and continuity of the episcopate a real, organic connection with the apostolic ministry, or any essential ministerial commission transmitted by the fact of episcopacy. There is as yet no understanding of episcopacy as of the *esse* of the Church.

There are those who would say that this is sufficient and that, granted this much, Anglican Churches should enter schemes of reunion and grow together with their non-conformist brethren into a fuller understanding of historic Faith and Order. But serious limitations of the non-conformist grasp of the meaning of episcopacy can be seen from its clear rejection of any doctrine or fact of the *priesthood*. A examination of many of the recent plans of reunion reveal that the word "priest" is rarely used at all and that the word "presbyter" appears instead to designate the second office of the ministry. It is usually argued that "presbyter" is the more correct term to use since it is an exact English translation of the New Testament term

"presbyteros". It is said to correspond more exactly to this than does the term "priest" which suggests the Greek "hier-eus" or the Latin "sacerdos". Presbyter is more Biblical and has the same meaning as priest. The argument is sometimes advanced in the United States that "priest" is the liturgical term appearing in *The Book of Common Prayer* and that "presbyter" is the canonical term appearing in the *Constitution and Canons*. Since reunion-schemes are constitutional documents, it is more fitting to use the canonical term.

These explanations are all very reasonable and if we had no more information than the mere words, the suspicions voiced by some would be unfounded. But it is interesting to note as one examines and collates the successive editions of reunion-schemes that the term "priest" appears not at all in some schemes, that it did appear in others and was removed through successive revisions; or that other material in the schemes renders the sacerdotal character of the office open to question. A uniform *tendenz* in a series of reunion-schemes to minimize "priest" and emphasize "presbyter" is at least suggestive that "priesthood" is truly being rejected. A specific examination of the many reunion-schemes indicates the import of this tendency.⁴

1. *The Church of South India*—The oldest reunion scheme and the only one which has come to fulfillment is that of The Church of South India.⁵ There is a complete absence in the formularies of this church of any specification of priesthood. The only reference to the fact of priesthood appears in *The Constitu-*

tion, II:7 (*Basis of Union*, Sect. 5), "The Ministry of the Church."

All members of the Church have equally access to God. All according to their measure, share in the heavenly High Priesthood of the risen and ascended Christ, from which alone the Church derives its character as a royal priesthood. All alike are called to continue upon earth the priestly work of Christ by showing forth in life and word the glory of the redeeming power of God in him. No individual and no one order in the Church can claim exclusive possession of this heavenly priesthood.⁶

With these words no one would disagree, but Anglicans would certainly have to take a further step and indicate that the high priestly character of Christ is communicated to more than just the priestly character of the Church, and that there is a ministerial priesthood distinct from that of the laity. All other references in the *Constitution* are to "presbyters" and the term "priest" is never used to refer to the ministry. The conclusion of Dr. E. L. Mascall of Oxford on this point seems to be inescapable. "It must be noted, however, that the *Basis* carefully, and presumably deliberately, avoids any suggestion that the ordained ministry of the Church participates in the High Priesthood of Christ in any other way than that in which the laity do; all that is said about it is that to it men have been called by God and set apart in the Church."

This careful avoidance of the word "priest" together with a doctrinal statement excluding the fact of ministerial priesthood in the constitutional documents of The Church of South India is most meticulously preserved in the liturgical formularies of The Church of South India. The *Ordinal* for use in this church is modelled very closely upon the Anglican Ordinal using the arrangement, sequence, and content of

*The Deposited Book of 1928.*⁸ A collation of the texts of the South Indian Ordinal and the Anglican Ordinal demonstrates that every reference to priesthood has been removed and that specific changes are made to minimize the sacerdotal character of the "presbyter".

The title of the service reads: ". . . for the Ordination of Presbyters", and all rubrics throughout the service refer to "Presbyter". The doctrinally significant rubric at the opening of the service in the Anglican Ordinal, ". . . there shall be a sermon, or Exhortation, declaring the Duty and Office of such as come to be admitted Priests: how necessary that Order is in the Church of Christ . . ." has been revised to read, "The sermon shall relate to the mutual duties and privileges of ministers and congregations in the Church of Christ." The stress upon the necessity of priesthood in the Church is thus removed.

The ordination begins with a Collect of South Indian origin referring to "ministers of Thy Word and Sacraments" and "this holy ministry" without any distinction of office. The presentation is made of "these persons to be admitted to the order of Presbyters," and they are greeted by the bishop as those "to receive this day . . . the holy office of this ministry." The bishop exhorts the congregation to private prayer for those "to be ordained Presbyters". The Litany contains a petition for those "to be ordained presbyters." The Collect for the Holy Communion is borrowed from the Anglican Ordinal with the careful substitution of "now called to the office of Presbyter." The charge of the bishop to the ordinands has been very much reduced in length by the omission of all passages referring to the

Church as the Spouse and Body of Christ and other references of a sacramental character. The vows are taken for "the office and ministration of Presbyters." The question put to the ordinands concerning doctrine omits the significant phrase of the Anglican Ordinal, "as this Church hath received the same." This deletion corresponds exactly to a similar deletion in the *Basis of Union*, Section 3, in which the Faith of the Church had originally been defined "as the Church hath always received it."¹⁰ The question concerning doctrine in the Ordinal and the provision concerning doctrine in the *Basis of Union* refer to the Holy Scriptures and the Creeds without any clause requiring them to be held within the context of the Church's historic tradition. The deletion made in the *Basis of Union* some time before the union was effected is now revealed to be deliberate by this careful parallel made in the Ordinal.

The long prayer preceding the laying on of hands follows the Preface-structure of the 1928 *Deposited Book*. Into this prayer are inserted the words "our great High Priest". It now reads in the South Indian Ordinal, ". . . Jesus Christ our great High Priest to be our redeemer. . . ." This is the only reference to priest or priesthood in the Ordinal. It is significant that this addition concentrates attention on the priesthood of Our Lord when every other change in the text avoids any suggestion of ministerial priesthood being conveyed by this ordination. This emendation expresses in liturgical form the theology of Orders set forth in the *Constitution*.¹¹ There is no ministerial priesthood distinct from the priesthood of the laity. Those who framed the

liturgical and constitutional formulae of the Church of South India were of a common mind, for both documents express a consistent theology of orders.

The formula of ordination reads, "for the office and work of a Presbyter in the Church of God," with no reference to the power of binding and loosing. The formula is an exact duplicate of the second alternative formula of ordination in the American *Book of Common Prayer*.¹² The absence of any reference to the power of priestly absolution corresponds to the doctrine stated in the *Constitution* that one power of the ministry is "to declare his message of pardon to penitent sinners."¹³ There is nothing faulty or careless in the construction of the formularies of the Church of South India. Both the constitutional and liturgical formularies consistently minimize the sacerdotal nature of the office of "presbyter." One cannot help but wonder how carefully these changes were examined by the Committee on Unity of the 1948 Lambeth Conference. The *Report* of that Committee states that the Church of South India "has used for the consecration of its bishops a form, and has prepared an ordinal, so similar in all essentials to those in use in the Anglican Communion that any suggestion that these forms were in themselves inadequate to convey the authority of the episcopate and the priesthood can be dismissed without question."¹⁴

As we turn from the Church of South India to those reunion proposals still in process of negotiation, we find a series of schemes for organic union and a series of schemes for intercommunion. These employ a device not present in the South India Scheme, that of sup-

plemental ordination. Supplemental ordination means a mutual laying on of hands to supply to each ministry what it lacked in separation. By this method the differing ministries are to be unified. The device raises many serious theological questions which are not easy to resolve. Those who hold to this method do so because of a theory that in divided Christendom all ministries are to some degree defective. But there are both Anglicans and non-conformists who see in supplemental ordination nothing but a surreptitious re-ordination. There are Anglicans who cannot see what possible grace could be bestowed upon Anglican priests by this device; and there are non-conformist ministers who reject it completely as an invalidation of their ministries. It was rejected in South India for this reason.¹⁵ It is the cause of controversy in Australia.¹⁶ It is at present the subject of debate in Ceylon.¹⁷ The problems connected with this method of unification of ministries have been extremely well summarized in the excellent *Appendix to the 1948 Lambeth Conference Report on Christian Unity*.¹⁸ The theory of supplemental ordination does mean at least that the fullness of the ministry of each church is to be conveyed to the other. This would require that the Anglican contribution be not only the episcopate but the priesthood as well. Yet we find in all of these documents employing supplemental ordination a consistent tendency to minimize the priesthood and its sacerdotal character. . . . The concept of supplemental ordination usually results in a formula for the extension of authority. It becomes not an ordination, but a commission to minister.

2. *The United States of America*—The successive sets of reunion-schemes between the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America and the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. were based upon the theory of supplemental ordination. This was described in the *Report of the Commission on Approaches to Unity* to the General Convention of 1940 and in the document *Joint Ordination*.¹⁹ It was elaborated in more constitutional detail in the document *The Proposed Basis of Union* . . . presented to the General Convention of 1946.²⁰ In this document the term "presbyter" appears throughout, usually accompanied by the term "priest" in parentheses.²¹ These references by themselves neither deny nor affirm explicitly the sacerdotal character of this office, although a question might be raised about the preference of "presbyter" to "priest". It can be suggested that this preference arises from the fact that the other negotiating group was a Presbyterian body. The sections on "The Ministry" in *The Proposed Basis of Union* do not offer much illumination on this point. Part I, Section 2, par. (f), "The Ministry," specifies that there are "prophetic, priestly, and pastoral functions committed to the Church by its Lord." Part II Section 2, par. (10), "The Presbyterate," describes the office, but aside from a rather non-committal statement on "the ministry of reconciliation and the cure of souls" does not give much clarification. It was clearly stated by the dissenting *Minority Report* of the Commission that ". . . the Presbyterian view of the ministry utterly rejects the Prayer Book idea of the priesthood . . ." and affirms that the terms of the *Proposed Basis of Union* are accommodated

to a Presbyterian rather than an Anglican view of the ministry. These statements leave the question open as to the intention to continue the priesthood in the united church.

This doubt, raised by the vague statements and the *Minority Report*, seems to be confirmed by the liturgical formula by which the commissioning or supplemental ordination is to be effected.²⁸ The service is not called an ordination, but "formal services of mutual recognition and extension of authority to minister in the united Church," and what is done is called "commissioned." The formula itself makes no mention of any office. The form to be used by Anglicans on Presbyterians reads:

The Ministry of the Word and Sacraments which thou hast already received is hereby recognized: and the grace and authority of Holy Orders as conferred by this Church are now added.

The Presbyterian form for use on Anglicans reads:

Take thou authority to execute the ministry and to dispense the Word of God and His holy sacraments in this united Church; in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

These formulae are curious liturgical compositions. What is said over the Presbyterians specifies no office at all. The sentence of recognition is elaborated by the use of the words provided in Canon 36 of the *Constitution and Canons of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America* for the letters of ordination of ministers of a non-episcopal communion ordained to the Anglican ministry.²⁹ The form to be used by Presbyterians is merely the sentence of jurisdiction from the Anglican Ordinal. These forms specify no office, suggest no sacerdotal function,

and the omission of "now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands" leaves the action quite devoid of any sacramental character. It is highly questionable whether these forms are anything more than the extension of jurisdiction. Certainly there is very little suggestion that this is an ordination to the priesthood.

The thinking behind these formulae was influenced by the proposals for intercommunion in Australia. A letter written in January 1942 by the Right Reverend Dr. Edward L. Parsons, retired bishop of California, to the Archbishop of Brisbane has recently been published indicating this influence.³⁰ A comparison of the Australian formula with the 1946 American proposals reveals that the *Proposed Basis of Union* in actuality is asserting the parity of Anglican and Presbyterian orders, and proposes to unify these ministries, not by supplemental ordination to supply a missing sacramental grace, but by a mere extension of authority and jurisdiction.

3. *Australia*—In Australia, there has been in progress since April 27, 1937, in the Province of New South Wales, a series of conferences between Methodists, Congregationalists, and Anglicans in an attempt to find some means of establishing intercommunion. This is not a scheme for organic reunion, but merely of inter-communion through the extension of a mutually recognized ministry. The device of supplemental ordination is the mode suggested to achieve this end. The problems raised by the conferences resolved themselves into the construction of a formula which could effect this extension of ministry.³⁰ The

formula was originally devised by the Right Reverend Reginald Halse, now Archbishop of Brisbane. In its original version it read:

Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God; and for a wider and more effectual service therein take thou authority to preach the Word of God, to fulfill the ministry of reconciliation, and to minister Christ's sacraments in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called or regularly appointed. And see that thou stir up the grace bestowed upon thee in the Call of God and by the laying on of hands.²⁷

The formula is open to certain literary objections. It is very verbose. The second sentence is awkward in sequence. The inclusion of material from the Anglican formula of consecration to the episcopate seems to achieve no end. The reference to "the laying on of hands" is rather more loosely tied to the act of imposition than in the Anglican original. But there seems to be no intention of stripping this action of its sacramental character. The clear reference to priesthood is most acceptable to Anglicans.

But since this first edition, the formula has had certain revisions. The latest edition of October 29, 1943, has changed the phrases "for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God" to "for the wider exercise of thy ministry in the Church."²⁸ The word "priesthood" is dropped. The change from "Christ's ministry" to "thy ministry" and from "the Church of God" to "in the Church" underemphasizes the divine origin of the Church and ministry and the continuity of this church with the historic Catholic Church. The other changes are largely literary and have no doctrinal intent.

One can scarcely agree with the Bishop of Newcastle, New South Wales, in

his commentary upon these revisions. "In the course of subsequent discussions, the wording of the proposed mutual formula received some modifications. . . . But its intention and purpose has in no way been modified. It seeks to secure the object at which the Group was aiming by bringing into existence a ministry whose authority to minister could be recognized as adequate by all denominations concerned."²⁹ The deletion of the word "priesthood" is a departure from a ministry acceptable to Anglicans. It is evident, from the lengthy discussion and debate which occurred in Australia over the question of whether this formula constituted an ordination or a re-ordination, that the form is intended to be merely the extension of jurisdiction.³⁰ The Preface to the latest revision states that "It is understood that the acceptance of a wider ministerial commission does not in any sense imply re-ordination, but . . . such an extension of ministerial authority as will accomplish the desired end."³¹ The declaration to be made by those receiving this commission defines the content of what is received through the laying on of hands as "such further authority as shall seem 'good to the Holy Ghost and to us'".³² The Collect preceding the laying on of hands states that it is to effect an "enrichment of our ministries in the service of thy Holy Church."³³ The revisions of the text, the commentaries upon it by members of the negotiating group, and the sense of the words in the surrounding liturgical action demonstrates that there is no intention whatsoever to convey the priesthood.

Parallel to these conferences in New South Wales, there has been another series of conversations between Angli-

cans and Methodists in Melbourne from 1932 to 1947.⁵⁴ These conferences resulted in a set of conclusions, but no specific proposals or suggestions. The inconclusiveness of the findings on the matter of the priesthood in these Melbourne conversations is an interesting commentary upon the empty content of agreement in the conversations in New South Wales.

Chapter IV of the printed findings deals with "The Christian Ministry", declaring its work to include "prophetic, pastoral, and priestly functions."⁵⁵ The priesthood of Christ and its communication to the priestly character of the Church is affirmed. The discussion of the priestly character of the ministry is less certain. Section 14 reads:

Without attempting definition, it may be said that the priestly functions of the Ministry are those which the Christian minister is authorized, by the Church, (a) to perform on behalf of Christ towards His people, and (b) on behalf of the Church in its approach to God through Christ.⁵⁶

Two additional sections illustrate this statement with many scriptural references. Section 17 is devoted to a vindication of the priesthood of the laity. At this point the discussion ends with an appended *Note on the Ministry as a Priesthood*. The traditional Catholic and Protestant "divergent streams of thought" are described, and the suggestion is made that both sides have much to learn.⁵⁷ It is apparent from this inconclusive report that no kind of agreement is yet possible in this area of Australia because of the obstacle of the priesthood.

4. *North India*—The Scheme of Union in North India has been in the process of Round Table Negotiation since 1929.

It is a plan for organic union between four bodies: The Anglican Church in North India, The United Church of North India, the Methodist Conference (British and Australasian), and the Methodist Conference (American). These negotiations produced a *Proposed Basis of Union* published in July 1947.⁵⁸ This was presented to the Lambeth Conference in 1948 and forms the subject matter of *Resolution 63*. Unfortunately this Lambeth judgment is now outmoded. The Round Table Conference revised the Plan in February 1948, but these revisions were not printed in time to come before the committee preparing the agenda for the Lambeth Conference. The final text to date of the plan is that approved in February 1948.⁵⁹

The Plan involves the unification of the ministry through a mutual laying on of hands, or supplemental ordination. Section VII, "The Ministry," of the *Proposed Basis of Union* sets forth the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.⁶⁰ This is elaborated by the description of the ministry.

The Ministry of the Church, alike in its priestly, pastoral and prophetic aspects, derives from the heavenly pattern of the risen and ascended Christ, who is at once the great High Priest, the Chief Shepherd of souls, and the Eternal Word of God. It is committed to us as a function of the whole body of Christ, and cannot therefore be claimed exclusively by individuals or by one order within the Church. (See Eph. iv.11-13, and I Cor. xii).⁶¹

In the last revision, changes were made especially in connection with the service of supplemental ordination and in the text of the formula to be used. All references to supplemental ordination were deleted. In Section VIII (iii), "The Initial Ministry of the Church," additions were made to the text to

emphasis the common lack in all ministries about to be unified. The theory of a common defect in all ministries in a divided church is the theological justification for the method of supplemental ordination.⁴² The additions made to the text are designed to strengthen this point of view. The words "in an act of supplemental ordination" are changed to "in a solemn act of humility and rededication with prayer." The statement of a common lack is amplified by the sentence, "In this act we seek the grace of God for the wider and more effectual fulfillment of our ministry under God's gracious providence in leading us into this union." The act of unification is not intended to be an ordination, but a mere extension of authority. In the clause "uniting with them the additional authority and grace that they lack in separation," the words "and grace" are now removed. This mutual laying on of hands imparts no "grace", but merely extended authority.

In line with this general revision of the theory of the unification, a significant change is made in the formula. This was borrowed originally from the first Australian intercommunion formula. In the 1947 edition of the *Proposed Basis of Union* it read: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry and priesthood in the Church of God."⁴³ Both the term "priesthood" and the distinction between "ministry and priesthood" have been removed in the revision of 1948. The latest text reads: "Receive the Holy Ghost for the fuller exercise of Christ's ministry in the office of a Presbyter in the Church of God. . . ."⁴⁴ The term "priest" and the suggestion of an ordination are removed.

A letter recently published by the

Reverend W. Machin, secretary of the Round Table Conference and a representative of the British Methodist Conference, serves as an explanation of these changes.⁴⁵ He states that the changes were made "at the request of our Church [the British and Australasian Conferences of the Methodist Church] backed up by a suggestion from the American Methodist Church in Southern Asia. . . . The changes were made because it was found that the existing wording was misunderstood." The wording is now clear that there is no order of the priesthood to be conferred and that the service of the unification of the ministry is not an act of supplemental ordination.

5. *Ceylon—The Proposed Basis of Church Union in Ceylon*,⁴⁶ recently revised and re-published, is the most promising of reunion proposals. It was given more enthusiastic attention than any other item on the agenda by the Committee on Unity of the 1948 Lambeth Conference.⁴⁷ Many revisions were made over the 1946 text.⁴⁸ A careful collation of the revisions indicates that most of them strengthen the Anglican contribution of the historic Catholic Faith. In matters of doctrine, sacraments, and liturgics, the revisions are all most commendable. With regard to the ministry, there is still considerable question as to the clarity of intention. The scheme involves the Anglican Diocese of Colombo of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon; the Methodist, Baptist, and Presbyterian bodies in Ceylon; and the Jaffna Diocese of the Church of South India.

The reunion is to be effected by a service of the unification of the ministry.

It has certain unusual features not present in other reunion schemes. There is a laying on of hands, but the term "supplemental ordination" is not used. It is proposed to incorporate into the united church the threefold order of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. At the time of unification, those chosen for the office of bishop are to be consecrated by those already bishops, and future ordinations to the second office of the ministry are to be episcopal ordinations. At the outset, the second order of the ministry is to be unified at a special service. No name is given to this. It is not called supplemental ordination, but is a new service at which no questions are asked or judgments rendered on any ministry. The Bishops shall receive the ministers of all the uniting churches by the laying on of hands and the use of a formula which asks God to bestow on each minister what God knows is lacking in his previous ministry. This is to be introduced by a Preface stating "the purpose and intention of the uniting Churches in taking this action and in formulating and performing these rites."⁸⁰ This Preface deserves careful attention.

The good hand of God being upon us, these several Churches, called together into visible unity as part of the Universal Church with an agreed basis of faith and order, desire at the inauguration of union, by the use of the liturgical forms herein set forth, to bring about such a unification of the sacred ministry in this Church as shall join together in one all the several inheritances of grace and authority which have hitherto been the possession of each Church in separation. In so doing, it is the intention of this Church to continue and reverently to use and esteem the threefold Ministry of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon which existed in the undivided Church.

Inasmuch as there are to be unified into the one ministry of this Church, ministries which have all been blessed as ministries of Christ's Church and owned by the Holy Spirit as effec-

tive means of grace, but which at the same time are different both in ethos and in authority, this Church recognizes that there is need for the ministers of all the traditions to receive by the diverse operation of the Holy Spirit such character, grace, gifts, and authority as they may now need.⁸⁰

Then follows the laying on of hands with this formula:

Forasmuch as you were called and ordained to the Ministry of the Church of God within the . . . Church, and are now called to the Ministry of the Church of God as Presbyter within this United Church; receive from God at my hands, the power and grace of the Holy Spirit to exercise the wider ministry of this office, and to nourish by Word and Sacraments all the members of Christ's flock within this United Church, in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Take authority to preach and teach the Word, to fulfill the ministry of reconciliation and to minister Christ's Sacraments in the congregation whereunto you shall be duly appointed. Amen.⁸¹

The service is clearly called, "A Service of Reception into the Presbyterate of the United Church of Those Already Ordained to the Ministry by the Uniting Churches."⁸² In the Thanksgiving Prayer preceding the laying on of hands, the same theory is stated in the petition to God, "Do Thou pour out Thy Holy Spirit to endue each according to his need with grace and authority for the exercise of the office of Presbyter in this United Church."⁸³

The question arises at once as to whether this is an act of supplemental ordination. A leading Methodist proponent of the Scheme, Mr. D. T. Niles, has called it "an open service" in his elaborate theological exposition of the Scheme recently published.⁸⁴ Bishop J. E. Lesslie Newbigin of the Church of South India⁸⁵ has most vigorously criticized the Ceylon Scheme on the grounds that the service is actually an ordination. Since the plan of union includes the Jaffna Diocese of the Church of South

India, Bishop Newbigin's criticism has certain practical implications. He states, "I cannot help thinking in spite of all that has been said, that the Ceylon proposals have that character. The act proposed as the condition of the unification of the ministries is an act of ordination. The fact that it is not called ordination does not alter the fact that it is, in every respect, a complete service of ordination to the ministry."⁸² Mr. D. T. Niles has jumped to the defence of the Scheme and answers Bishop Newbigin on this point.

The one interpretation which the Ceylon *open Service* completely rules out is that it is a service of *re-ordination*: for both in the preface as well as in the formula, it is explicitly stated that the ministers who are being received through this Service into the presbyterate of the United Church are all ministers of the Church of Christ and have been ordained as such. What the Ceylon service leaves open is the *possibility* of the interpretation that this service *includes* an act of *supplemental* ordination. It is quite incorrect to say that this is a service of supplemental ordination which is not called as such, for there is no sense in refusing to give it a name if a name can be honestly given. On the other hand, a name is not given precisely because it is an *open Service*. . . . The Ceylon service provides a service of *unification* of Churches and their ministries, the nature of the unification act being open to God's sovereign decision. We dare not defend any of God's gifts against the further action of God, whatever be the nature of that action.⁸³

Thus Anglicans would question whether this act is supplemental ordination or not. A Methodist defender states that it might be such. A leader of the Church of South India, arguing in favor of the South India method of acceptance of all ministries *ab initio*, finds that it is re-ordination. There is no doubt that the expression of these diverse points of view by those concerned with the formulating of the proposals will require further revision.

As one studies the rest of the text of

the scheme, one finds very little illumination on this point. The various statements on the ministry in the plan, and the liturgical arrangements for future ordinations to the presbyterate, are confusing and inconsistent. In Section I, "The Nature of the Union", the theory of a common defectiveness in all ministries of divided Christendom is stated and the assertion is made that all ministries are "real ministries of the Word and Sacraments".⁸⁴ Section 6, "The Ministry," sets forth the claim that the Church is "the priestly Body in which all members of the Church, according to their measure, share in the heavenly High Priesthood of the Risen and Ascended Christ" and that "no individual and no one order in the Church can claim exclusive possession of this heavenly priesthood".⁸⁵ The second order of the ministry is usually referred to as the Presbyterate. But parallel with these statements are a series of references to "priesthood". "Ministerial priesthood" appears in Section 7:II.⁸⁶ Section 7:II (b) refers to "A presbyter (i.e. priest)", although the formula borrowed from the Anglican ordinal specifically states, "Receive the Holy Spirit for the office and work of a Presbyter".⁸⁷ By some curious coincidence, one of the Collects provided for the Service of Reception at the unification of the ministries reads, "Thy servants called to the office of priesthood".⁸⁸ A collation of the 1946 and the 1948 texts of the Scheme would suggest that many of the earlier references to priesthood were not edited when this new service of the unification of the ministries was inserted. There is not a consistent theology of orders expressed in these constitutional and liturgical texts.

The questions raised by the service of unification, the discussions of the meaning of that service among non-conformists in Ceylon, and the references here and there to "priesthood" leave the Ceylon reunion proposals in a fluid state. One cannot judge the intention with regard to the priesthood at this present moment. If further revisions follow the pattern of proposals in South India, the United States, North India, and Australia, it would seem a safe prediction that these references to priesthood will soon be deleted.

6. *Iran*—Discussions regarding church unity in Iran between Anglicans and Presbyterians began in 1912. The document, *A Draft of the Proposed Constitution for the Union of the Presbyterian and Anglican Episcopal Churches in Iran*, was published in 1945.⁶² The Iran Scheme accepts all ministries at the outset in a service of unification. It is clearly stated that this is not supplemental ordination but an extension of authority.

The first act of the newly consecrated bishops of the Church of Christ in Iran shall be to commission by the laying on of hands all of the ordained Ministers of both the uniting churches for service in the Church of Christ in Iran. Such a Commission does not imply re-ordination or a repudiation of the validity of the orders of either Church as real ministries of the Word and Sacraments, but rather an extension of ministerial authority which is conferred on all concerned by the fact of union.⁶³

The formula for use on this occasion reads:

Receive the Holy Spirit for the work of a presbyter in the Church of God, both for the continuance of that work which thou hast done hitherto and for the performance of that work which is now committed unto thee by the laying on of our hands.

Take thou authority to preach and teach the Word, to fulfill the Ministry of reconciliation

and to minister Christ's sacraments in the congregations whereunto thou shalt be further called and lawfully appointed; and see that thou do all these things in brotherly partnership with God's fellow workers whom in this union of Churches He has made thine.⁶⁴

So specific are these statements that the Committee on Unity of the 1948 Lambeth Conference was compelled to state that it could not regard this as in any sense implying episcopal ordination.⁶⁵

After the union, all ordinations to the presbyterate are to be performed by bishops and presbyters jointly.⁶⁶ The definition of the work of the presbyter limits sacramental powers to this office,⁶⁷ but the absence of any liturgical formulae for the ordination leaves the question open as to the meaning of this office. The fact that the scheme accepts from the outset all ministries through a form of commissioning would suggest that there is no intention to continue the historic priesthood of the Church.

7. *Canada*—In Canada, a plan for intercommunion by the formation of a mutually acceptable ministry between the Church of England in Canada and the United Church of Canada was published in 1946.⁶⁸ These proposals have certain features not common to any other scheme. The negotiating bodies clearly recognize that the two ministries are entirely different in ethos and nature.

We have considered the subject of the Ministry in both Communions and are of the opinion that these two Ministries are best considered as parallel to one another rather than identical. The Church of England has the threefold Ministry of Holy Orders; the United Church has the Holy Order of Presbyterian Ministry in which there is no distinction of orders, and has its Church Courts. . . . It is, therefore, impossible to say at any point that there is an exact identity.⁶⁹

The only method for identifying these

ministries would be for the ministers of each communion to receive ordination at the hands of the other.

The whole Committee considers it desirable, therefore, that in any future union each Communion should contribute the *whole* of its ministry each to the other. As a step towards this end, we suggest that once each Communion is satisfied that the formularies of the other teach sufficiently the true Christian Faith, and after sufficient instruction of the Ministers in the practical exercise of the other Ministry, any Minister of the United Church could receive Holy Orders according to the form and manner of the Church of England in Canada, and any clergyman of the Church of England in Canada could be admitted to the Ministry of the United Church by the appropriate Court of that Church, and according to the form used in the United Church Book of Common Order.⁷⁶

The detailed arrangements provide for a complete exchange of ministries. The priest of the Church of England is examined, licensed to officiate, and then ordained according to the form of the United Church. The United Church minister is confirmed, ordained deacon, and then ordained priest according to the Ordinal of the Book of Common Prayer.⁷² The forms for use are those taken from the official ordination services of each communion.⁷³

These proposals raise by implication serious theological questions which are not faced in the document. It is quite evident that the grace of the priesthood is given to the United Church ministers. But the content of the grace given to the Anglican priests is not defined. The Report states that

... this United Church Ministry possesses a quality and tradition of its own. They recognize among other things that it is of a specifically constitutional character because, through the operation of the Church Courts, the faithful people and the presbyters have an effective voice in the outward call of a man to the Ministry and in the recognition of his inward call. There is also the special quality of this Ministry which is harder to define but which manifests itself in the pulpit Ministry, in the conduct of public

worship, and in the sharing of pastoral care with the members of the local Church session.⁷⁴

There is nothing, however, in this description which suggests any grace beyond that of a commission. A commission can be given by any duly constituted body, but it hardly requires the sacramental action of ordination.

The Report further declares that no questions are asked about the validity or regularity of the ministry. It is proposed "that in both cases it should be made clear, by a preface to be read before the Service, that in neither case is any man denying the reality of the Ministry he has already received and exercised, but that he is seeking a commission for a further Ministry, and the necessary grace from God to perform the same."⁷⁵ The Preface itself reads:

... we come to these solemn acts wherein we convey each to the other the graces of our several ministries, neither denying to the other its heritage in the Holy Catholic Church, nor the reality of its ministry, as a ministry of Christ, but both desiring to increase our gifts and enlarge our opportunities for the extension of Christ's Kingdom.⁷⁶

These declarations indicate that it is not an ordination but an extension of jurisdiction with spiritual power to enable the person to perform it. The document includes two contradictory points of view. It provides for a mutual supplementary ordination in action, while denying it in theory. The Canadian Scheme, which is one of the newest explorations in the field of reunion, has just begun to raise the vast theological questions connected with supplemental ordination which were so well summarized in the Unity Report of the 1948 Lambeth Conference.⁷⁷

Just what would be accomplished by this set of proposals was questioned by

the 1948 Lambeth Conference. "As compared with constitutional schemes they do not sufficiently provide for a real growing together such as would lead to an organic union."⁷⁸ The reception given these proposals in Canada has been quite lukewarm, and it is apparent that further revisions will have to be made if more interest is to be developed.⁷⁹

This survey of reunion-schemes involving the Anglican Communion indicates the extent to which the theory of supplemental ordination has been a principle of construction, in the attempt to bridge the gap between episcopal and non-episcopal ministries. This theory, advanced by the Lambeth Conference of 1920, has now run its course in reunion negotiations. The report on the theological difficulties appended to the 1948

Lambeth Conference document is sufficient indication of this fact. But as it is used in this variety of reunion-schemes, it ends with the abandonment of the priesthood. In South India, the entire method was rejected as part of the scheme. In the United States, Australia, North India, and Iran, the concept of the priesthood is lost while the method remains integral to the plans. In Ceylon and Canada, the attempts to cling to the priesthood have raised contradictory elements into an inharmonious dualism. As far as practical affairs are concerned, there has yet to be worked out any reunion-scheme based on supplemental ordination which can maintain the priesthood. None of these schemes enable the Churches of the Anglican Communion to contribute to the united Church the whole of its ministry.

FOOTNOTES

¹Cf. L. A. Haselmayer, *Lambeth and Unity* (N. Y. and London, 1948), pp. 19-23.

²A. G. Hebert, *The Form of the Church* (London, 1944), and K. E. Kirk, *The Apostolic Ministry* (London, 1946).

³D. T. Jenkins, *The Nature of Catholicity* (London, 1942); J. E. L. Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church* (London, 1948); and T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry* (London, 1948).

⁴For published texts of reunion schemes, cf. G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity* (Oxford Univ. Press, 3 vols). For bibliography covering all pamphlet and commentary material, cf. H. R. T. Brandreth, *Unity and Reunion: A Bibliography*, 2nd ed. (London, 1948).

⁵The final edition of the text of the *Basis of Union and Constitution of the Church of South India* is the *Proposed Scheme of Church Union in South India*, 7th edition, reprinted with additional Matter on pp. 22 and 90-96 (Christian Literature Society for India, Madras, 1947). Relevant documents concerning the union can be found in G. K. A. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. III, 224-233. Many references to the voluminous controversial writing are given in H. R. T. Brandreth, *op. cit.* A convenient summary of the events is contained in L. A. Haselmayer, *The Church of South India* (Morehouse-Gorham, N. Y., 1948).

⁶*Proposed Scheme of Church Union . . .*, p. 29.

⁷E. L. Mascall, *Priesthood and South India* (Dacre Press, London, 1944), p. 2. Cf. also G. W. Broomfield in *Towards a United Church 1913-1947* (Edinburgh House Press, London, 1947, p. 172).

⁸*Order of Service for the Inauguration of Church Union in South India with the Form of Consecrating the First New Bishops and the Order of Service for the Ordination of Presbyters* (United Society for Christian Literature, Redhill, Surrey, 1948). For an analysis of the text of this Ordinal, see E. R. Hardy, Jr., "The New Ordinations in South India," in *The Living Church*, October 5, 1947, pp. 17-18.

⁹On the significance of this rubric, see F. L. Cirlot, *Apostolic Succession and Anglicanism* (Lexington, 1946), pp. 73-78. L. A. Haselmayer, *Lambeth and Unity*, p. 145.

¹⁰J. E. L. Newbigin, *The Reunion of the Church*, p. 129 and n.2.

¹¹*Proposed Basis of Church Union*, p. 29.

¹²On this cf. L. A. Haselmayer, *Lambeth and Unity*, p. 107, n.60.

¹³*Proposed Scheme for Church Union . . .*, pp. 30-31.

¹⁴*Lambeth Conference, 1948* (S.P.C.K., 1948), Reports, p. 47.

¹⁵L. A. Haselmayer, *The Church of South India*, p. 7 and n.11. Cf. also S. C. Neill, "Church Union in South India" in *Towards a United Church*, pp. 122-123.

¹⁶F. de Witt Batty, *The Australian Proposals for Intercommunion* (S.P.C.K., 1948), pp. 47-50.

¹⁷J. E. L. Newbigin, "The Ceylon Scheme of Union" in *The South India Churchman*, June 1948, pp. 162-163 and D. T. Niles, "The Ceylon Scheme" in *The South India Churchman*, November 1948, pp. 250-252.

¹⁸*Lambeth Conference 1948*, Reports, pp. 64-66. The theory of supplemental ordination was first set forth by the 1920 Lambeth Conference, *An Appeal to All Christian People*, Section VIII. The Report on the Unity of the Church of the 1930 Lambeth Conference records the failure of this suggestion to capture the attention of non-conformity. Lambeth Conference 1930 (S.P.C.K., 1930), p. 118. A theological basis was provided for this method by Canon O. C. Quick in *The Doctrine of the Creed* (N. Y., 1938), p. 341, and C. C. Richardson, *The Sacrament of Reunion* (N. P., 1940), pp. 18-31. A sympathetic plea for this method appears in G. Bloomfield, *Anglican and Free Church Ministries* (S.P.C.K., 1944). The theological problems raised by the schemes employing this method are presented without resolution of the basic cleavages in the 1948 Lambeth Report.

¹⁹*Journal of Convention, 1943*, Appendix 29, pp. 599-613.

²⁰*Journal of Convention, 1946*, Appendix 41, pp. 654-680.

²¹*Proposed Basis of Union*, II, 2 (2), (3), (1); III, 2 (a), (b); III, 3 (b); IV, 2, 4; V, 2 (a).

²²*Journal of Convention, 1946*, p. 665.

²³*Proposed Basis of Union*, III, 2 (b).

²⁴Canon 36, "Of the Ordination of Deacons and Priests in Special Cases," Section 6 (b). "The letters of ordination in such cases may contain the words: Recognizing the ministry which he has already received and hereby adding to that commission the grace and authority of Holy Orders as required for the exercise of the ministry of this Church." *Constitution and Canons*, 1946, p. 89. Note the subtle changes by the omission of "that commission" and "as required for the exercise of the ministry".

²⁵"... To work that out we took as the basis your plan, which we know commonly as the Australian Plan. It is, of course, the same principle, but it enabled us to put the phrasing a little differently, and to bring a somewhat different emphasis. The changes which we have suggested in it are quite minor, and, of course, grow out of our immediate needs, and the fact that there are only two bodies concerned." Cited in F. de Witt Batty, *The Australian Proposals for Intercommunion*, S.P.C.K., 1948), p. 43.

²⁶A full account of the proceedings and text is given in F. de Witt Batty, *op. cit.* Cf. also an article on these by Ivan L. Holt, "Australian

Church Unity Plans" in *Christendom*, Spring, 1948.

²⁷F. deWitt, Batty, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

²⁸*ibid.*, p. 55.

²⁹*ibid.*, p. 40.

³⁰*ibid.*, pp. 47-50.

³¹*ibid.*, p. 54.

³²*ibid.*, p. 55.

³³*ibid.*, p. 55.

³⁴*Report of the Melbourne Anglican-Methodist Conferences on Reunion* (Diocesan Book Society, Melbourne, Victoria, 1947).

³⁵*Report of the Melbourne . . . Conference*, p. 18.

³⁶*ibid.*, p. 19.

³⁷*ibid.*, p. 23. "... seeing this, it is widely asked, if we cannot yet so gain the mind of Christ (where truths can not stand in contradiction) as to think alike in this matter, can we not so adjust our thinking and utterance that we no longer deny the truth which others hold."

³⁸G. K. A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity*, vol. 3, pp. 212-224.

³⁹*The Proposed Basis of Negotiation . . . revised and approved by a meeting of the Round Table Conference held at Allahabad . . . February 20th, 21st, and 22nd, 1948*. Also *Suggested Constitution of the United Church* (Allahabad Christian Press, 18 Clive Road, Allahabad, India, 1948).

⁴⁰*The Proposed Basis of Negotiation . . .*, p. 4.

⁴¹*ibid.*, p. 5.

⁴²Cf. *Lambeth Conference 1948*, Appendix to Report on Christian Unity, Reports, p. 64.

⁴³*Lambeth Conference 1948*, Reports, p. 60, and G. K. A. Bell, *op. cit.*, vol. 3, p. 216.

⁴⁴*The Proposed Basis of Negotiation . . .*, p. 6.

⁴⁵*Friends of Reunion Bulletin* (obtainable from 21 Portugal Place, Cambridge, England), April 1948, p. 8.

⁴⁶*The Proposed Scheme of Church Union in Ceylon* (S.P.C.K.: Printed for private circulation, 1948). The omission of the earlier edition of the Ceylon Scheme from G. K. A. Bell, *Documents . . .*, vol. 3, seems a curious oversight.

⁴⁷*Lambeth Conference 1948*, Reports, pp. 57-59.

⁴⁸The 1946 text of the Scheme of Church Union appears as *Interim Report of the Negotiating Committee for a United Church in Ceylon*, in *The Church Union Gazette*, Autumn, 1946, pp. 2-6. *The Church Union Gazette* was published by the (English) Church Union, 6 Hyde Park Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

⁴⁹*Proposed Scheme . . .*, Section 8 (b), (iii), p. 23.

⁵⁰*ibid.*, p. 23.

⁵¹*ibid.*, p. 23.

⁵²*ibid.*, p. 25.

- ⁸⁰*ibid.*, p. 27.
- ⁸¹D. T. Niles, *The Temple of Christ in Ceylon* (Methodist Missionary Society, London, 1948), p. 14.
- ⁸²J. E. L. Newbigin, "The Ceylon Scheme of Union" in *The South India Churchman*, June 1946, pp. 162-163.
- ⁸³D. T. Niles, "The Ceylon Scheme" in *The South India Churchman*, November 1948, pp. 250-252.
- ⁸⁴*Proposed Scheme of Church Union . . .*, p. 15.
- ⁸⁵*ibid.*, pp. 16, 18, 20, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30.
- ⁸⁶*ibid.*, pp. 17 and 18.
- ⁸⁷*ibid.*, p. 20.
- ⁸⁸*ibid.*, p. 26.
- ⁸⁹G. K. A. Bell, *Documents . . .*, vol. 3, pp. 233-243.
- ⁹⁰*ibid.*, p. 241.
- ⁹¹*ibid.*, p. 241.
- ⁹²*Lambeth Conference 1948*, Reports, p. 61.
- ⁹³G. K. A. Bell, *op. cit.*, p. 239.
- ⁹⁴*ibid.*, p. 238.
- ⁹⁵*A Report from the Committee on Re-union* (General Synod of the Church of England in Canada, Toronto, 1946). Printed in G. K. A. Bell, *Documents . . .*, vol. 3, pp. 181-202.
- ⁹⁶*Report from the Committee on Reunion*, p. 9.
- ⁹⁷*ibid.*, p. 10.
- ⁹⁸*ibid.*, p. 10.
- ⁹⁹*ibid.*, p. 10.
- ¹⁰⁰*ibid.*, pp. 12-17.
- ¹⁰¹*ibid.*, p. 9.
- ¹⁰²*ibid.*, p. 10.
- ¹⁰³*ibid.*, p. 10.
- ¹⁰⁴*Lambeth Conference 1948*, Reports, pp. 64-66.
- ¹⁰⁵*ibid.*, p. 54.
- ¹⁰⁶Cf. the statement of the Most Reverend G. F. Kingston, Primate of the Church of England in Canada in *The Canadian Churchman*, November 4, 1948, p. 3: "The conversations so far have not proved fruitful in consummating a plan for a mutually acceptable ministry. . . . We are anxious that the conversations may continue, and in the light of all the proposals for reunion reported at Lambeth it may be possible to work out a plan which will be more acceptable to all concerned than the one under discussion now."

THEOLOGY LOOKS AT ESP

By J. RANDOLPH FIELD

St. Andrews Church

Princess Anne, Maryland

No jest is intended when it is said of ESP that there is more to it than meets the eye. While research in thought transference outside the channels of the five known senses is very much in its earliest stages, enough has been done to warrant more serious attention than the investigation has been receiving. Especially might philosophy and theology be alerted by the work that is being done at Duke University and elsewhere, for these experiments promise to have effects upon the former as far reaching as the doctrine of relativity, and to in-

fluence the latter as greatly as has Darwin's *Origin of Species*.

Theology will avoid the controversy that has been raised concerning checks and controls in the ESP laboratories. Much has been spoken and written about "chance," about "unconscious whispering" and other types of sensory clues. On the whole, it would appear to the impartial observer that adequate precautions have been taken against any leak through sensory perception. The mathematical validity of the results obtained from experiments has been amply

substantiated.¹ Therefore, while these points continue to be debated, theologians and philosophers will leave them to the scientists at work in the field, and will view the results objectively.

Interest in telepathy and clairvoyance, which is the original approach to ESP, is as old as recorded history. But spiritualism has always stood in opposition to the scientific method, and the first serious work in this field was begun in 1882, when the Society for Psychical Research was founded in London, primarily to carry out experimental studies. An extensive amount of investigation has since gone on in Europe and America, piling up conclusive evidence of extra-sensory perception.

The real trail blazer in parapsychology, however, is Prof. Joseph Banks Rhine, who since 1930 has been carrying on some quite remarkable experiments at Durham.² His work has been done chiefly with especially prepared cards, each bearing one of five distinctive devices. The subjects of these experiments have been required either to match or identify the markings on the cards. If the experimenter shuffled the cards without knowing how they stood at the end of the shuffling, or if they were prepared by means of a mechanical shuffler, the subject who could score consistently ahead of chance expectation was called clairvoyant. If instead of aiming at the cards themselves, the subject aimed at impressions in the mind of the distant experimenter, deciding

which device he was thinking at a given moment, positive scores were labeled not clairvoyance but telepathy. If the experimenter was looking at the symbols which the subject was attempting to identify, and if the subject did succeed in scoring ahead of chance, the result was classified "general extra-sensory perception," a form of cognizance in which either telepathy or clairvoyance, or both, might be involved.

In the matching techniques it is of course imperative either that the key cards be inaccessible to the senses or that each card within the hands of the subject be sealed in an opaque envelope. The latter method was, for example, used in one study with blind subjects, just to make assurance doubly sure, since in the case of all subjects hyperesthesia of the sense of touch must be taken into account, along with all known forms of hyperesthesia. Naturally, distance is the simplest way of taking care of the known senses. The series most emphasized by Dr. Rhine in his *Extra-Sensory Perception* was one performed with subject and experimenter in different buildings, separated by a distance of some hundreds of yards.

It can not be said too clearly that research in extra-sensory perception is yet very much in its infancy. All that its findings can hope to do thus far is to point directions. Nevertheless, these directions seem to be rather clearly marked.

In the first place, ESP appears to strike a heavy blow in favor of philosophical realism, in contradistinction to the nominalistic doctrine that there are no universal essences in reality. It may indeed be clear, after all the years of

¹See article by Edward V. Huntington, "Is It Chance or ESP?" in *The American Scholar*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 201-210.

²Whately Carington dates the modern phase of ESP research as beginning with the publication of Dr. Rhine's book, *Extra-Sensory Perception*, in 1934.

controversy, that what a general or abstract term names is an unitary reality, existing independently of human awareness. ESP, so called, may not be 'so much "extra-sensory" as the development of a new sense capacity by which the human organism receives stimuli from these extra-spatial realities.'³ The old sophism about what happens to the jump after the cat is in the chair may not be so ridiculous as was once supposed. *Jump* may be a reality, having intelligible qualities independent of the eyes that see the cat's movement, through space and at a point of time, from the floor to the chair.

Dr. Rhine's more recent activities have been directed toward another aspect of ESP. He has found that some of his subjects have the ability not only to match cards, employing either clairvoyance or telepathy, but in addition can predict in advance the positions they will take in an unshuffled deck. It is clear that this goes a step beyond the earlier experiments, and it is this third aspect of extra-sensory perception, appropriately called precognition, which promises to be of special interest to students of thought concepts. It is not too much to suggest that ESP is leading to a synthesis between two hitherto opposed philosophies. Dr. Einstein's famous theory has demonstrated that there are as many ways of measuring

time as there are observers, and that all are right. Precognition could be the application of this principle to thought transference. If so, it would be indicated that realities may be perceived both before and after they are sensible to sight, hearing, smell, taste or touch. *Before* and *after* are time concepts. Clairvoyance and telepathy hint at the abolition of space as a significant factor in thought transference. Now, to these has been added precognition, which promises to have the same effect upon time. Under certain conditions and through certain media—media which are not yet explained—the cat's jump may be perceptible both before the animal has moved from the floor and after it is resting in the chair. Or to borrow from another classical discussion, harmony may have real existence apart from the lyre; and if so Simmias was correct when he postulated that "the harmony must still be somewhere, and the wood and strings will decay before anything can happen to that."

Upon theology ESP promises to have some equally significant effects. Theology, even more than philosophy, has always been troubled by time and space, for these two concepts, together with mass, provide the line of demarcation between finity and infinity. While the human mind, dealing speculatively, can admit of infinity, limitations of time and space have stood as a barrier against any completely successful penetration beyond the confines of finity. When theology says that God is infinite it is meant that divinity is not encumbered by these limitations. If ESP can point a way of escape from time and space it has made a real advance in the eter-

³"To me, one thing stands out clear: Extra-sensory perception is strictly a manifestation of the same mind with which the psychologists have been dealing for a century. However, it is the normal mind operating beyond normal limitations. It is the mind attempting to 'see' when seeing with the senses is impossible. It is the mind searching for answers which reason alone cannot supply. It is the mind reaching out for facts beyond the barriers of time and space." J. B. Rhine, Ph.D., "Have You Second Sight?" in *American Magazine*, November, 1946.

nal effort of men to understand the mind of God, and has, perhaps, suggested an avenue which must be thoroughly explored by any theology that can lay claim to intellectual honesty.

Imagination staggers to consider where these developments might lead. To indicate but one among several possibilities, the theology of creation may finally and for all be divorced from anthropomorphic conceptions. Instead of separating thought and action, it can now be understood that they are one and the same, or at least but different aspects of the same creative force. It will be seen that thought is, itself, genital and generative, and that an idea in the mind of God is tantamount to a creative act. Since finite man, at least at the present stage of human development, must express himself in and through finite language, it is still necessary to mark the time sequence, and humanly speaking it must be said that thought precedes action. But of the two aspects of making or creating, thought is primary and the real agent, while doing is secondary and merely the necessary finite concept. God, who is of course free from all finite limitations, can and does dispense completely with the secondary, and thus creation is the pure action of the divine mind.

To say this much is simply to reiterate the better parts of the Genesis account and to repeat St. John's emphasis upon the Word of God as the agent of creation. ESP begins to be pertinent when attention is turned manward, and parapsychology is recognized as another step in the evolutionary development of human capabilities. Can it be that after all the measureless aeons of slow and painful growth man is now approaching

the fulfillment of his destiny, and that the sons of God are at last to be freed from finite limitations? Surely, if it can be demonstrated that the human organism possesses a potential sixth sense, an additional perceptual ability that operates independent of the traditional five senses and functions without regard for space or time, it is not too much to imagine that the day may come when the human mind will exert forces sufficiently potent to manipulate nature. It is no new departure to insist upon the essential reality of ideas, or to assert the control of the mind and the spirit over the material. But to postulate the mind acting independently and beyond the limitations of the physical organism, *making* and *doing* by the sheer force of rational fiat, is to foresee man transcending his present finity and eventually working together with God as an unencumbered agent in the continuous and ascending drama of creation.

Prof. Gardner Murphy of Columbia University, writing a few years ago in *The American Scholar*, charged psychology with complacency in its attitude toward ESP, which he believes is the Archimedean lever "for a replacement of 17th-century naive mechanism by other conceptions more characteristic of 20th-century scientific adventure." If work in this field has not received the attention it deserves that is because the data are incompatible with a world view that has been fixed by the discoveries of physics, mathematics and biology. "Psychology, youngest of the experimental sciences, has been content to model itself upon physics and biology and instead of challenging their tenets has felt that its own scientific status

depended in large part upon acceptance of the standard world view."⁴

Dr. Murphy wrote in 1938. Since then ESP has won many new friends, others have been attracted to Dr. Rhine's

⁴Gardner Murphy, "Dr. Rhine and the Mind's Eye," *The American Scholar*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp. 189, 192, 200.

work and have undertaken parallel investigations, and much has been done to break down psychology's self-imposed obscurantism. It remains for theology and philosophy to recognize and examine ESP, and to apply the scientific findings in extra-sensory perception to their own particular departments.

THE PLACE OF ORIGIN OF MATTHEW'S GOSPEL

By J. SPENCER KENNARD, JR.

New York City

For interpreting the community Gospels, Mark, John, and Matthew, historical environment is essential. Mark is assigned to Rome and distribution of John to Ephesus. But as yet there has been no agreement about Matthew. For Luke, addressed to an individual, provenance is of minor importance.

1. *Origin outside of Palestine.* Jerusalem cannot have produced Matthew, which reflects a struggle against the older orthodoxy. Its Hellenistic compromises are quite out of accord with the Jacobean teaching. In particular it dispenses with the kosher food laws that had become a key issue between Jacobean and other communities; in this respect it conforms to the stand of Peter prior to the rebuke from James in Galatians 2:11-13, and to that ascribed to Peter in Acts 10 and 11 also. A church so zealous for the primacy of James as to make him first witness to the risen Lord cannot have sung the praises of Peter. Moreover it could not have stood

for Matthew's onslaughts against the Pharisees with whom it was living on cordial terms.¹

Surely a Gospel coming from the fountainhead of Judaism would have been written in Hebrew or Aramic. The narrative portions are so inferior, and the spirit so out of touch with that of Jerusalem, as to suggest development at quite a distance from the scenes of Jesus' labor.

If Matthew originated in Palestine at all, the only place worth considering is Caesarea. Here even Jewish congregations must have used Greek. Also no locality in Palestine is more connected with the name of Peter, who tarried there after winning a notable Gentile convert (Acts 10:48) and later, after his escape from prison, found a place of refuge there. The Clementina further confirms his ties with Caesarea (e.g. *Recog.* 3:74). Acts gives much

¹See Edwin B. Redlich, *Form Criticism* (1939), pp. 87ff.

prominence to Caesarea and preserves a fixed body of tradition associated with it (8:26-40; 9:31-10:48). The bitter hatred between Jews and Gentiles prevailing there² fits in with the message of reconciliation.

But Caesarea is untenable. The difficulty is not, as Streeter maintained,³ that "Enter no town of the Samaritans" (Matt. 10:5) precludes this chief port of Samaria, for such limitations were annulled by the final, "Go therefore and make disciples of all nations" (28:19). Such an argument would eliminate Streeter's own thesis of Antioch; for the preceding words in 10:5 are, "Go nowhere among the Gentiles".

Caesarea must be rejected on several other grounds. The Jewish population, placed by Josephus at 20,000 had been annihilated at the beginning of the First Rebellion (*War* 2.18.1; 7.8.7). The writings of Origen show that Caesarean theology was of the Apollos type, an inevitable result from Caesarea being a link between Samaria and Alexandria. Such a perspective was more suited to John than to Matthew. Moreover expressions like "their synagogues" (Matt. 9:35; 13:54), "their cities" (11:1), "that place" (14:35) suggest a locality outside of Palestine. This impression is confirmed by the vagueness and inaccuracy of geographical allusions.⁴ The quest for a remote locality is not invalidated by, "you will not have gone through all the towns of Israel, before the Son of man comes" (Matt. 10:23)⁵

²On denial of citizenship to Caesarean Jews, see Hugo Willrich, *Des Haus des Herodes* (1929), p. 176.

³Streeter, *The Four Gospels* (1925), p. 502.

⁴See B. W. Bacon, *Studies in Matthew* (1930), pp. 17f.

⁵For contrary opinion, Allen, *I. C. C. Matthew*, p. 107.

as the meaning imputed to Jesus is that although persecution will be severe there will always be a place of refuge.

² *Objections to Antioch.* Streeter's argument for Antioch is valid only for the place from which Matthew was distributed. The Gospel of John, distributed from Ephesus but originating possibly in North Africa, is analogous. Even though Matthew was distributed from Antioch, a very different sort of community produced it.

Matthew is too Jewish to have originated in such a Gentile center as Antioch. Ignatius, the first church leader to defy Judaism by speaking of Jesus as God⁶ illustrates the Antioch type of religion. Its break with Judaism extended back to the beginnings of the Christian community, for "in Antioch the disciples were for the first time called Christians" (Acts 11:26). The "-ian" designated factional strife, and applied especially to rival parties in the Civil Wars.

Moreover the angel of the church of Antioch was Paul. By contrast, Matthew is thoroughly Petrine; it attacks Paul's doctrines and makes Peter the scribe of the new dispensation. At opposite poles from Paul is Matt. 5:17-20, where the model Christian is one whose righteousness according to the Law exceeds that of the Scribes. The waxing cold of the love of many in 24:12 appears to be due to the spread of Paul's attack on the Law. Though Paul's followers profess great deeds, Jesus will say to them, "I never knew you; depart from me, you evil-doers" (7:22f).

The author's anti-Pauline tendenz appears also in his alterations of older

⁶Ignatius, *Ep. Ephes.*, chs. 7 and 18.

materials. He has distorted the Q parable of the Fast Closing Door (Luke 13:24-27) into God's judgments awaiting the followers of Paul (Matt. 7:13-23); in order to make clearer the reference to Paul's anti-nomianism he has changed "workers of iniquity" (*ἀδικίας*) in Luke 13:27 to "workers of lawlessness" (*ἀνομίαν*). The man without a wedding garment (Matt. 22:11-14), which he interpolates into the Q parable of the Great Supper, seems to designate followers of Paul; they will be cast "into the outer darkness".⁷ To Mark's parable of the Patient Husbandman he has subjoined a supplement, the Tares (Matt. 13:24-30, 36-43); these "stumbling blocks" and "doers of *ἀνομίαν*", who have grown side by side with the good wheat within the Kingdom (the church), will be burned with fire (vv. 41f). Mark's story of the Man Exorcising Demons (Mark 9:38-41), which makes Jesus tolerant of schismatics, he omits.

No gestures of universalism can compensate for such bitter feeling toward Paul's followers. Hence Streeter's efforts to balance the two trends as expressions of opposing groups whom the author seeks to placate, must be rejected.

There is also a difficulty in the name Matthew. Those who distributed this Gospel must have been ignorant of the book's true authorship. And they could have been ignorant only if the distribution center differed from that of origin. Here too there is analogy to John. Had Matthew originated in Antioch it must have suffered a long period of uncertain identity, as seems to have been the fate of the Fourth Gospel prior to its Jo-

hannine ascription in some center ignorant, like Ephesus, of its true authorship.

Finally, there is Matthew's complete ignorance of Luke. Mutual independence is one of the axioms of New Testament criticism.⁸ A gap of twenty years may separate the two Gospels, with Luke in circulation not later than A.D. 95 and Matthew perhaps not till A.D. 117. The Gospel of Luke must have reached Antioch early. Even though the "We" source of Acts is precarious evidence for associating the Third Evangelist with Paul's travels, he seems to have been honored in Antioch, which was the alleged place of his birth.⁹

3. *North Syrian hinterland.* Even though Antioch itself must be rejected as the place of origin, a good case can be made for its hinterland. What was produced in the hinterland would most likely be distributed from Antioch. Moreover the hinterland fulfills all other requirements. Hence the late Benjamin W. Bacon contended that Matthew arose somewhere along the trade routes from Antioch to Parthia, in a center like Aleppo, Edessa, or Apamea.¹⁰

A strong Jewish population lived in this region. Society remained Oriental and the people were ruled by aristocracies of priest-kings. But in the larger cities Greek had displaced the older Semitic tongue. Had Matthew been produced for smaller communities it would have been written in Syriac.

Especially pertinent to the hinterland

⁷See esp. Paul Wernle, *Synoptische Frage* (1899). An attempt to set aside this "axiom" is M. S. Enslin, *Christian Beginnings* (1938), pp. 432ff.

⁸Eusebius, *H. E.* 3.4.6. For bibliography, Schmiedel, "Luke", in *Enc. Biblica*, col. 2832.

¹⁰Bacon, *Studies in Matthew*, ch. I.

⁷Allen, *I. C. C. Matthew*, pp. lxxvi ff.

is Matthew's attempt to placate non-Christians. The altering of older materials to emphasize the importance of reconciliation is one of the author's most conspicuous forms of *tendenz*.¹¹ It would seem that making friends with Roman officials had become the condition of survival. Christians and Jews were engaged in mutual recrimination. The danger was that both would perish together. Matthew's zeal for reconciliation is born of experience; the more bitter the experience the more ardent his zeal. No more terrible ordeals within this period of history could have called it forth than the massacre at Osrhoene or the destruction of Edessa as reprisal for the Jewish uprising of A.D. 116. These events

¹¹See my "Reconciliation Tendenz in Matthew", *A. T. R.*, 28 (1946), pp. 159ff.

afford a basis for dating the document.

Local color is added by the resemblance in Matthew's apocalyptic outlook to that of the Enoch cycle, portions of which are said to reflect the geography of this hinterland.¹² A further ground for believing that Matthew originated here is that the area appears to have been a chief center of Petrine religion.¹³ The evidence is linked with the highly complicated Nazorean problem. The name Nazorean seems to be especially associated with this same area, and among Semitic peoples to have come to designate Christians because of contacts with the Peter faction.

¹²Chaim Kaplan, in *A. T. R.*, 12 (1930), pp. 534ff.

¹³Cf. Walter Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (1934), pp. 119-122; Philip Carrington, "Peter at Antioch", in *A. T. R.* 15 (1933), pp. 1-15.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. By Christopher R. North. New York: Oxford University Press, 1948, pp. 247. \$4.50.

Occasionally a book appears to which one may attach the adjectives "definitive" and "indispensable". Professor North has produced such a book on the most baffling of all the problems of Old Testament scholarship, the interpretation of the so-called "Servant Songs" in Second Isaiah. This book will be indispensable to all future students of the problem because of the sheer mass of information which it contains. It is definitive, not because it gives a definitive solution to the problem, but because it so clearly defines all the intricate issues involved. The bibliography is a good example of the comprehensive character of the work. It covers thirteen pages; still the author modestly assures us that it is not "exhaustive".

The book is divided into two main parts: the first contains a history of the interpretation of these passages from ancient times to the present day; the second, a critical commentary on the text with a general summary in the final chapter, in which the author sets forth his own conclusions. In the first chapter he deals with Jewish interpretation and shows that the various schools of thought found amongst Christians with respect to the problem—those which refer the figure of the Servant to the righteous in general, to the Messiah, to the nation, to some historical individual—all have had their parallels among the Jews. The author maintains that the Messianic interpretation found in Targum Jonathan must be at least older than Christianity "since the Jews would hardly have begun to interpret the passage of the Messiah . . . after the Christians had already claimed it for Christ."

The remaining chapters in Part I deal with the history of Christian interpretation. Professor North has no doubt that the early Christian identification of the Servant with Jesus "was derived from the consciousness of Jesus Himself." This crucial point is not developed at great length, and New Testament scholars will probably feel that the author has dismissed too easily the objections which many have felt, but there seems no good reason to reject the basic

conclusion. The real complexity of the whole problem of identifying the Servant became apparent only at the end of the 18th century. From that time to the present the attempt at solution has been in perpetual flux, and the book traces all the involutions and convolutions of the history of interpretation in great, if sometimes wearisome, detail. The great landmark of this period was Duhm's separation of the Servant "songs" from their general context in Second Isaiah, and all later scholarship is dependent on his work. Professor North accepts Duhm's analysis on the whole, although not his identification of the Servant with an historical individual.

The critical conclusions of Professor North are worthy of great respect in view of the thoroughness with which he has studied the evidence and the sense of serious-minded fairness which pervades his book. He believes the "songs" to have been written by Deutero-Isaiah himself subsequent to the larger body of his prophecies. The differences within the songs are to be explained by their having been written over a considerable period of time, which made possible a gradual development in the portraiture of the Servant. The most striking feature of the author's critical position is his acceptance of the Messianic interpretation of the Servant as over against the collective interpretation which holds almost universal sway in the English-speaking world. His conclusions are not based on any new evidence nor on any highly original interpretation of the evidence at hand, but rather on a thoughtful survey of the alternative theories which leads him to conclude that all other interpretations are open to insuperable difficulties. There is no indication that theological presuppositions have played any part in determining this conclusion.

ROBERT C. DENTAN

Berkeley Divinity School

Unbekannte Jesusworte. By Joachim Jeremias. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948, pp. 88. Fr. 7.

"Unknown words of Jesus" must be very numerous indeed in view of the rather widespread biblical illiteracy of our day, but it is

not of this that Professor Jeremias of the University of Göttingen writes. Rather his subject is a number of sayings attributed to Jesus which are not found in the four canonical gospels. What sort of sayings are they and where are they to be found? Which if any of them can lay claim to genuineness and what are the criteria of their authenticity? Dr. Jeremias devotes the first section of his work to these problems; the origin of extra-canonical tradition; the sources; the question of genuineness, and the significance of such scattered dominical sayings for gospel research. The second and by far the longer division of the book is given over to detailed examination of a score of sayings which in the author's opinion may be of historical value.

The possibility that some hitherto unknown word of Jesus might still be brought to light was dramatized in 1897 by the discovery and publication of a scrap of papyrus about the size of a postal card, containing half a dozen decipherable sayings each introduced by the formula, "Jesus says." Three of these agreed rather closely with sayings already known from the Synoptic Gospels, but the other three were unfamiliar. One of the latter was popularized in this country as the subject of a poem by Henry van Dyke. The saying itself is cast in the Hebraic poetical form known as synonymous parallelism and reads: "Raise the stone and thou shalt find me; cleave the wood and there am I." Did Jesus actually utter these words and if so how are they to be interpreted? Jeremias points out that the form and grammatical constructions are "typically Palestinian", although the content presents difficulties, suggesting a "pan-Christic" tendency which ascribes to Jesus cosmic ubiquity. Indeed the couplet is preceded by a fragmentary sentence which may be no more than an expansion of such sayings as Mt. 18:20, 28:20, the latter referring to the omnipresence of the risen Christ. However, Jeremias thinks that the couplet is an allusion to Eccles. 10:9, "Whoso removeth stones shall be hurt therewith, and he that cleaveth wood is endangered thereby." No, says Jesus, work is not a peril and a burden, but a blessing sanctified by his presence. Should this be the meaning of the saying, van Dyke was perhaps justified in calling it, "Gospel for the heavy laden, answer to the labourer's cry."

Since the discovery of these sayings at Oxy-

rhynchus in Egypt, archaeologists have unearthed other papyri likewise containing what appear to be the remains of lost gospels. But long before such modern excavations, scattered sayings attributed to Jesus had been known to scholars through quotations made by early ecclesiastical writers. These are usually referred to as *agrapha* or "unwritten", the implication being that they circulated only in the form of oral tradition until they were first cited by some Christian author. Thus the term is somewhat misleading, since it is probable that most of these sayings were derived from some apocryphal gospel, several being specifically cited from the otherwise lost Gospel according to the Hebrews.

Still another source is the occasional appearance in some ancient manuscript of the gospels of a saying not found in the majority of copies, for example, the addition to Lk. 6:5 found only in the sixth century Codex Bezae (D), which reads: "On the same day he saw a man working on the Sabbath and said to him, Man, if you know what you are doing, you are blessed, but if you do not know, you are accursed and a transgressor of the law." If this was meant to teach the abolition of the Sabbath it could not be genuine. However, Jeremias holds that here Jesus was reckoning with the possibility that the man was doing some labor of love such as he himself performed on the Sabbath on more than one occasion; if on the other hand he was acting merely from frivolity and irreverence his action was to be condemned. Do you know what you are doing? asks Jesus; does your conscience condemn you or not?

Finally there are in the New Testament outside the gospel narratives, notably in Acts 20:35 and in Paul's letters, several references to some remembered word of Jesus, which are also sometimes included among the *agrapha*. A thorough-going attempt to collect and study all of the extra-canonical sayings of Jesus was made by Alfred Resch, in 1889, under the title: *Agrapha; Ausserkanonische Evangelienfragmente*. Seven years later, but a year before the discovery of the Oxyrhynchus sayings, J. H. Ropes published a more critical investigation of the same material under the title: "*Die Sprüche Jesu, die in den kanonischen Evangelien nicht überliefert sind. Eine kritische Bearbeitung des von D. Alfred Resch gesammelten Materials.*" Ropes showed that a very large number, more than

eighty, of the *agrapha* were to be rejected as either not intended as sayings of Jesus or erroneously quoted as such; more than forty others he pronounced spurious; concerning a dozen or so he reserved judgment, and a like number he regarded as valuable. All this is reviewed by Jeremias as an introduction to his own study.

None of the rejected sayings is examined in detail, but half a dozen pages are given over to a general discussion of such sayings under six classifications: pure inventions, often with heretical tendencies; tendentious transformations of genuine sayings; sayings mistakenly attributed to Jesus through faulty memory; alterations of genuine sayings by the addition of explanatory material; sayings of doubtful historicity because of their content; sayings doubtful because of their attestation. In his treatment of the twenty-one sayings which in his judgment may be genuine, Jeremias undertakes not only to weigh and answer the objections, but also to determine so far as possible the circumstances in which the words might have been uttered by Jesus and to give an exposition of their meaning. While the approach to the critical problems is thoroughly scholarly, the exegesis is often what may be termed homiletical. Indeed, it might be an arresting experience for modern congregations if an occasional sermon were preached on some of these texts. Whether or not the gospel is really "the old, old story" to any large number of church-going people today, such an experience might help to make it what it was at the beginning, both new and "news." Nevertheless, it is surprising how scanty this extra-canonical material really is, how little of it is of value, and how rarely it adds to our knowledge of the teaching of Jesus. The familiar themes are repeated: controversies with Pharisaism; eschatological demands upon the followers of Jesus to face trials and dangers for the sake of the Kingdom, and above all the high ethical standards of the way of love. No palaeographer's deciphering of tattered papyri can discover "another Jesus" or "another gospel". For knowledge of "all that Jesus began both to do and to teach" we are still dependent almost exclusively upon the New Testament.

What was said to Augustine of Hippo centuries ago might well be taken as a personal

message to every would-be disciple: *Tolle, lege*—"Take up and read!"

OSCAR J. F. SEITZ

Bexley Hall

L'Eglise et les Ministères. By Philippe H. Menoud. Neuchâtel: Delachaux and Niestlé S.A., pp. 64. Fr. 2.85.

This is the latest volume (22) in the *Cahiers Théologiques de l'Actualité Protestante*, which already includes some of the most vigorous theological writing of the present day. Dr. Menoud's book does not engage in the discussion which has been going on at Geneva, Montpellier, and Neuchâtel, over the ecclesiastical organization of the Reformed Church, but is a study of the data contained in the New Testament without regard for the current debate. The book will thus no doubt make a much more serious contribution to the discussion than one which was ostensibly a polemical or at least an argumentative pamphlet.

The author insists that the nature of the church is a question prior to that of the ministry. The continuity of the earliest church with the Jewish Church is fully recognized. At the same time, the fundamental importance of the Holy Spirit for the life, for the very existence of the church, as represented in the New Testament, is equally recognized. "The church without the Spirit would be nothing but a sociological phenomenon . . . the Spirit without the church would have produced nothing but a society of mystics" (p. 11). In the New Testament, the priesthood is primarily that of Christ: there is no conception of priesthood apart from his divine office. The apostles were primarily witnesses to the Resurrection, but they were inspired witnesses. "Their words are the words of God. . . . There was no function in the church which apostleship did not include" (p. 31). It was because the apostles were primarily witnesses to the Resurrection that they were unknown after the first generation.

The various ministries described in the New Testament all proceed from the Spirit: "One does not serve the church except in response to a vocation" (p. 36). What surprises us most about the New Testament account of the ministry is the "richness of the life of the church from its very beginning. The ministries exercised within the church are numerous, varied,

apparently little defined, and only slightly differentiated one from another. It is thus with every organization at its inception. It should be added that the circumstances under which the primitive church lived were not everywhere the same. If the patriarchal organization of the synagogue served as a model to the church in Palestine, Paul gave to the pagan Christian church a sense of divine order, such as must reign in the Body of Christ as it does everywhere in creation (p. 54).

In a final brilliant chapter, Dr. Menoud describes the church as a "Christocracy." The authority of the church comes from above. It belongs to Christ the Spirit who is the head of his body, the church. It passes on to those whom Christ has chosen for himself, the apostles, and in turn to those who are called to assist and succeed them. The church is thus a "Christocracy" or, more accurately, an "apostolic Christocracy" (pp. 59-60). All of the members receive the Spirit in order to live by it, and not for the purpose of obtaining high functions. The church is therefore a "charismatic institution," but at the same time, even within the New Testament, it appears that the organization of the church displays an equilibrium between inspiration and tradition. "The New Testament does not give as a matter of fact a model according to which the church must be organized and controlled in all of the details of its life. The very development of an ecclesiastical life and its necessary adaptations to new circumstances would have rendered illusory and vain any definitions of this nature" (p. 63).

It is obvious that with such a positive and constructive view of the New Testament church and its ministry, written by an eminent New Testament expert, most Anglicans must have profound sympathy.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Union Theological Seminary

Writings of Saint Augustine, Vol. IV ("Fathers of the Church"). Translated by J. J. Gavigan, J. C. Murray, R. P. Russell, and B. M. Peebles. New York: Cima Publishing Co., 1947. pp. 494. \$4.50.

This is the fifth volume to appear in the projected 72-volume series of translations of the Fathers, under the general editorship of Dr. Ludwig Schopp. Readers of this review were in-

April, 1949, issue (Vol. XXXI, p. 118); hence introduced to the series by Dr. R. M. Grant in the no further comment is needed here as to the reliability and usefulness of this scholarly contribution to patristic study. Three of the five volumes now in print contain translations of works of St. Augustine. The present volume includes four works, written at different times and for different purposes, yet all of them exhibiting St. Augustine's genius in synoptic treatment of the chief elements of Christian faith, ethic, and practice. They are: "Christian Instruction" (*De doctrina Christiana*), a handbook in homiletics; "Admonition and Grace" (*De correptione et gratia*), a summary of his mature positions on the questions raised by the Pelagian controversy; "The Christian Combat" (*De agone Christiano*), an ascetical work of his early episcopate, especially useful for its treatment of heresies; and "Faith, Hope and Charity" (*Enchiridion*), the most famous, perhaps, of all of St. Augustine's syntheses of his teaching. All of these works have been available heretofore in the English translations of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, First Series, except the *De agone Christiano*, which is here Englished for the first time. Brief introductions and bibliographies put the student on the track of the most pertinent literature concerning each of the four treatises.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

Episcopal Theological School

The Religious Orders in England. By Dom David Knowles. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1948. pp. 348. \$8.50.

All readers of the earlier volume (1940) by Dom Knowles, *The Monastic Order in England*, have been eagerly waiting for this promised continuation. They will not be disappointed. There has been a change in plan, reflected in the title, for this volume includes a long section (140 pages) on the Mendicant Orders. This addition has made it impossible to carry the story on to the Dissolution in this volume. The period covered is a little over 120 years, from the Fourth Lateran Council to about 1340.

The subject is divided into three parts. The first deals with the older Orders, their reorganization in accordance with the Lateran decrees, their economic history, the visitation system. While it is admitted that the visitation system

did not completely fulfill its function, it is held to have been of real value. The conclusions drawn concerning the state of the monastic houses, and those of canons regular, are these: (1) small dependent priories and houses belonging to foreign abbeys were "almost without exception lax in discipline, if not positively corrupt"; (2) the majority of the larger houses "show a decent mediocrity." "The period was one neither of fervour nor of widespread decadence."

The second part deals with the Friars, chiefly the Franciscans and Dominicans, though the smaller groups, Carmelites etc., are given a short chapter. The earlier chapters of this section tell not only of the arrival of the Friars in England, their rapid extension to almost all the centers of population, and their popularity, but also give an analysis of the Franciscan and Dominican ideals and their modification as the Mendicant Orders developed. The last three chapters are concerned especially with intellectual history—the Franciscan school at Oxford; its first masters; the controversies centering around the Dominican Kilwardby, who became archbishop of Canterbury, and the Franciscan Pecham, who succeeded him as archbishop.

The last part, "The Monasteries and their World," returns to the old Orders. There is a chapter on the cathedral monasteries, and one on the monastic boroughs and their desire for independence. The chapter on the Abbot shows the enormous revolution which had taken place in Benedictine history since its beginning. The abbot is no longer the father of a little family but a great feudal lord, a public figure, a man burdened with the administration of large properties. (In the first part there is a splendid account of one of the most successful of these administrators, Henry of Estry, Prior of Christ Church, Canterbury, 1285-1331.) The chapters on the daily life of the monastery and on the intellectual life are rather tantalizing, as only a few matters are touched on.

This work inevitably challenges comparison with Dr. Coulton's *Five Centuries of Religion*, dealing with the same subject. Dom Knowles writes with more understanding of the Religious Life, natural in a professed Benedictine, with a knowledge of the sources well-nigh as encyclopedic as that of Dr. Coulton, and with immeasurably greater skill in arrangement of his material. His judgment, though more favorable,

does not differ greatly from that of Coulton. He says, "The heavy weight of the social and economic fabric of the world was pinning the monks to earth"—words which might be applied to the Church in many ages.

These volumes (the story is to be carried down to the Dissolution) will probably remain for years the best account of the Religious Life in England. This slight summary gives only the very feeblest indication of the riches of information to be found in them.

W. FREEMAN WHITMAN

Nashotah House

Canonization and Authority in the Western Church. By Eric Waldram Kemp. New York: Oxford University Press, 1948, pp. 196. \$4.00

The scholarly standard of this volume is vouched for by the fact that it has been chosen as the first number in the "Oxford Historical Series" edited by F. M. Powicke and B. H. Sumner. The treatise is a detailed, but no less readable, account of the history of canonization of saints from the earliest days of the Church to the present day, and as such this monograph supersedes all other previous treatments of the subject in comparable compass. In particular the study is concerned with the development by which the papacy succeeded in reserving for itself the right to authorize the veneration of new saints, thus supplanting the ancient liberty of bishops in adding new festivals to the Calendar of their respective dioceses. The change took place in the course of the 11th and 12th centuries, and was part and parcel of the recovery of papal power associated with the Hildebrandine reform. Particular attention is given to the canonization of English saints in the Middle Ages; and it is of interest to note the circumstances by which certain worthies who were popularly venerated achieved official recognition by the papacy in contrast to those who did not. The author traces carefully the development from the idea of "translation" to "canonization," the late distinction between "beatification" and "canonization," and the ambiguities in Roman Catholic writers regarding the "infallibility" of papal decisions respecting canonization. Above all, this work is a valuable contribution to the history of Canon Law in medieval times.

MASSEY H. SHEPHERD, JR.

Episcopal Theological School

Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli. By Roger Ley. Zürich: Zwingli-Verlag, 1948, pp. 160. Fr. 9.

Dr. Ley has written a careful study of Zwingli's developing thought on church discipline. The main body of his book is divided into two sections. The first considers Zwingli's position up through the critical *Statute of December 15, 1526*. Dr. Ley regards this law as a turning point in Zürich church history, for hereby the State became the official guardian of the Church. The ecclesiastical work of excommunication was turned over to the City Council. Throughout this section of his work Dr. Ley holds that two incompatible principles have been struggling for mastery over Zwingli's thought: the right understanding of the power of the keys (preaching, godly admonition, and avoidance of sinners) *versus* the false, over-legalized concept (emphasizing absolute purity of the congregation, expulsion of the wicked, and discipline preeminently in terms of punishment). By 1526 the latter principle has won a decisive victory.

The second half of the book deals with the last years of Zwingli's life, 1527-1531. Here we find Zwingli shrinking from too-frequent use of excommunication. Yet in the face of his friend Oecolampadius's warning that "the secular arm which has authority over the Church is worse than Antichrist himself," Zwingli fought ever harder for his state-church ideal, holding that a church without a secular arm is maimed and incomplete. His work culminated in the *Sittenmandat of 1530*, in which the interweaving of civil and religious functions in Zürich were climaxed. The Council issued this "Morals-mandate", ordered church attendance, and punished the religious excommunicand with civil banishment. To be sure the Zürich magistracy had its own interest in preserving a God-fearing people, but a fearful price was paid when the involvement of state with church discipline and the triumph of the legalistic principle made parishes into police states and pastors into prosecutors.

Dr. Ley draws certain conclusions from his study. For him proper church discipline depends on a right understanding of the relationship between Gospel and legal order. It must be achieved as a service of love in the interests of salvation. Reconciliation and remission of sins are the key concepts, not punishment. Church discipline is a pastoral, not merely juridi-

cal, procedure. There is no simple solution to the problem; it remains something for each age to deal with, and the form of church discipline can never be final.

RICHARD H. WILMER, JR.

University of the South

The Bogomils, a Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism. By Dmitri Obolensky. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1948, pp. xiv + 317, with Map. \$6.50.

If "Manichaeism" means nothing more than dualism then the Bogomils who created so much stir in the Balkans and in Asia Minor in the Middle Ages may be labelled Neo-Manichaeans, but if it means the system founded in the third century by Mani the Persian Sage, then no evidence produced in this book suffices to connect the Bogomils with it. Indeed on the evidence presented this reviewer is by no means convinced that they can even be proved kin to the better known Paulicians.

It is a pity that so much of our information about the Bogomils has to be drawn from the writings of their adversaries, for it is fairly clear that they were, in spite of their quaint beliefs, good folk whose moral standard, even if somewhat over-ascetic, was well above the average level of that of the communities among whom they lived. Indeed they seem to have kept so well their own Gospel precepts of prayer and fasting, of purity and compassion, of truth and humility, of avoidance of covetousness and cultivation of brotherly love, that well into the fourteenth century they were attracting a goodly number of earnest souls who were repelled by the corruption of the Church and the unchristian lives of professing Christians.

Perhaps the most interesting to us of their curious teachings is that of the two Sons of God, the elder brother Satanael who, stricken with pride, revolted against the Father, and had to be cast out of heaven with his following, and the younger Son, the Logos, who is at once the archangel Michael and Jesus and Christ, and who accomplished his mission by descending into Hades, binding Satanael, and depriving him of the *-el* of his name. It is a curious coincidence that recent work by Michael Higger on the *Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer* has reminded us of the parallel Jewish legend of Sammael, who in being cast down tried to

drag down with him that Michael who succeeded to his rank.

Dr. Obolensky's earlier chapters discussing the Manichees, the Paulicians, Marcionites, and Mes-salians are interesting but quite unconvincing. His chapters on the Bogomils themselves, however, under the First Bulgarian Empire, in the Byzantine world and under the second Bulgarian Empire, are unusually informative, and have the advantage of making available to us material from Slavonic sources generally inaccessible.

ARTHUR JEFFERY

Columbia University

A Treasury of Russian Spirituality. Compiled and edited by G. P. Fedotov. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1948, pp. xvi + 501. \$6.50.

While much has been written on the history and the dogmatic theology of the Orthodox Eastern Church, very little has appeared in Western languages on the subject of its spiritual life, which is after all its very heart and soul. The present work is not so much a study of Russian spirituality as an anthology, a selection from original sources. It is perhaps the first work of its kind to appear, and it is made by the man who, of all living men, is probably best equipped to make it, Professor Fedotov, whose work on *The Saints of Ancient Russia* (in Russian) and *The Russian Religious Mind* (Harvard University Press) have already contributed so much to the knowledge of this field. The material for this work is taken from the lives of the saints, ascetical and mystical treatises, and spiritual autobiographies from the eleventh to the twentieth centuries.

In a short but remarkably comprehensive preface, Professor Fedotov shows how ancient Russian Christianity (contrary to what is usually supposed about the Orthodox Church) is marked by strong social tendencies. But from the time of St. Sergius, Russian mysticism takes two divergent directions, the mystical and the social. The mystical tradition was almost entirely absent in the early Kievan period, and it was driven underground after the sixteenth century for about two hundred years, that is, during the period of the Muscovite tsardom.

Professor Fedotov dwells on the fact that "the most remarkable phenomenon of early Russian spirituality is the immediate impact of

the Gospels upon the minds of the first Russian saints. Thus the rediscovery of the Christ of the Gospels, of the Christ in His human nature behind the Byzantine Pantocrator (the 'omnipotent' or the 'Divine Monarch'), which was a great feat of the twelfth century in the West, was anticipated by about a century in the spiritual life of Russia."

Dr. Fedotov suggests that the use of the Slavonic language in the Bible and in the Divine Liturgy contributed to the uniqueness of the Russian religious genius. He emphasizes "Kenoticism," that is to say the self-emptying charity and humility which embraces the way of non-resistance and voluntary suffering as the most precious and typical motif of Russian Christianity. He shows, however, how this motif had to contend with political, social, and economic forces, which were not at all favorable to its development. He shows incidentally how this "Kenoticism", detached from God and from charitable humility, is at the root of both Russian atheism and Tolstoy's radical negation of culture. And, of course, this Kenotic element has been balanced and supplemented by other currents, liturgical, mystical, culturally creative, derived in part from Byzantium, and more recently from the Christian West.

The first saint to be dealt with is Theodosius of the eleventh century. He is the first representative of Kenoticism, and the first saint to be canonized by the Russian Church. His spirituality has a practical, social aspect. He put on an "uncouth garb" and did manual labor in the fields, side by side with the serfs, despite the bitter opposition of members of his family. One finds in him a close association with the person of Christ in His earthly life and in the Blessed Sacrament. His life, as recorded by the monk Nestor, which is reproduced in this volume, reveals a most powerful and attractive personality.

St. Sergius was the first hermit and mystic of Russia. In Sergius we have the combination of hero and saint, which has penetrated so deeply into the heart of Holy Russia. Sergius, too, is renowned for his charity and humility. Though of noble birth, he did not shrink from the most menial labor, and at the height of his national fame he is found tending the kitchen garden. He lived during the period of the Tartar yoke, and it was he who blessed Prince Demetrius of Moscow as he went forth to his

great battle of Kulikovo, 1380, the first Russian victory over the Tartars. It was in his time that the close union of Church and State in Russia, fraught with such great consequences both for good and for evil, took its rise.

St. Nilus Sorsky is the teacher of spiritual prayer. He was influenced both by writers of the ancient monastic tradition and by the later Hesychast School of mystical experience. The strong personality of the saint shines out in his life and in his writings. He is fearfully aware of the reality and insidiousness of sin. He is a world-denying ascetic, but at the same time he is a friend of human freedom. He protests against the ownership of land by the monks and against the persecution of heretics. He is by no means uncritical in his transcription of the Lives of the Saints. (Russian writers of the Lives of the Saints record their failings as well as their virtues and show greater powers of criticism than do their Western brethren.) He holds the human intellect in high esteem and his letters are instinct with a fiery vibrant love which is seldom surpassed in Russian religious literature.

Avvakum, the conservative rebel as Fedotov calls him, stands in a class by himself. His ultra conservatism made him a heretic from the point of view of the official Church. (It is significant that the one great schism in the history of the Russian Church was due to ultra-conservatism.) His religious outlook is in many ways at the other extreme from that of St. Nilus. The law of God rather than the love of God is the supreme factor in his religion. Greatness of soul is combined with narrowness of intellect, and yet there is something of the Old Testament prophet about him, and even of the charity of our Lord amid the frightful persecutions to which he was subjected. One cannot read without deep emotion the account of how his poor wife and he tramped on over the mud and ice of a barbarous land amid hostile natives and the most savage persecutions of his enemies. One senses the tragedy of her question to her husband: "How long, Archpriest, are we to suffer thus?" I answered: "Until our very death, Markovna!" And she replied, with a sigh: "So be it, Petrovich, let us plod on."

St. Tychon of Zadonsk is a westernizing Kenotic of the eighteenth century. Anglicans will note with pleasure that he was strongly influenced by one of the distinguished theologians

of the seventeenth century Church of England, Joseph Hall, Bishop of Norwich. He is the original of Dostoevsky's monk Zosima in *The Brothers Karamazov*. There is a great difference between the melancholy recluse of Zadonsk and the Christian humanist of Dostoevsky, but the common bond was charity and humility.

St. Seraphim of Sarov was one of the greatest mystics and prophets of Russia. Professor Fedotov reproduces in this work the brilliant and suggestive study of A. F. Dobbie-Bateman, including Motovilov's conversation with St. Seraphim on the aim of the Christian life (the acquisition of the Holy Spirit).

The Way of a Pilgrim describes the life of a simple, obscure saint, whose strength and inspiration was derived from the constant exercise of the "Jesus-Prayer".

In John of Cronstadt, 1829-1908, we have an uncanonized saint who belonged to the married secular clergy, not a mystic nor a contemplative in the ordinary sense. He deviates sharply from the main pattern of Russian sanctity. He was active in both spiritual and corporate works of mercy, but he was above all a man of prayer and a teacher of prayer. His wonderful works of healing were effected by constant prayer, in union with the prayers of his patients and their friends. We find in him the simple evangelical conviction that God can not refuse to hear the prayer of insistent petition, accompanied by self-oblation. "Father John had a fruitful experience of liturgical prayer, and the influence he exerted in bringing the Eucharist to the fore was his chief legacy to the Russian Church." All of us can profit by his teaching on prayer and holiness, which is reproduced in this volume.

Many readers will be helped most by the last saint here reproduced, one of our own contemporaries, Father Yelchaninov, who might almost be described as a Russian Orthodox Pascal. We see in him not only a great teacher of self examination, but an embodiment of all that is best in Russian Orthodoxy, persecuted and exiled. He is wholly aware of the weaknesses in contemporary Orthodox life and suggests corrective action. He is tragically aware of the constant battle with sin and suffering, and his faith comes out of the fiery furnace.

Professor Fedotov has given us a great book and Sheed and Ward are to be congratulated on bringing it out. The book needs an index.

The prefaces and notes by Dr. Fedotov add immeasurably to the value of the work.

WILLIAM H. DUNPHY

Philadelphia, Penna.

Bildungslehre: Umriss eines Christlichen Humanismus. By Konrad Zeller. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1948, pp. viii + 372. Sw. Fr. 16.

This book is different from most books on educational philosophy in that it deals rigorously with the problem of relating educational method to evangelical Christianity. It discusses both general education and religious education. So far as educational methods are concerned the author's thought is inspired chiefly by his great Swiss predecessor, Pestalozzi. He uses the word Humanism to describe his educational philosophy. By this is meant education of the whole man, the emotions as well as the intellect. The subtitle with its reference to Christian Humanism needs explanation. It seems to mean two things: (1) that Biblical Christianity is also concerned with the whole man, both body and spirit, with human freedom and responsibility as well as with divine grace; (2) that humanistic education as it is understood in this book is compatible with Christianity on condition that it is recognized that the transition from the educated man to the redeemed Christian is a miracle of grace.

The author prepares for his view of the relation between education and evangelical Christianity by emphasizing the full depth of the paradox of grace and freedom. From one perspective all is of grace. From another perspective we are responsible for taking every step possible to assist the development of a child. The educator has a free field for his human efforts but he must recognize that though he may help children to develop into persons who combine knowledge with emotional health, even so good a result becomes an obstacle to Christian redemption if it is regarded as self-sufficient. Openness to transformation by divine grace must accompany all educational achievements. There is much in the book about the specific Christian channels of grace.

The author may not have provided adequate answers but he asks questions that are seldom asked by American educators in or outside the Church. He makes an effort to deal with the conflict that is so generally acknowledged be-

tween educational theory and the various revivals of the theology of the Reformation. So far there have been few such efforts. His radical conception of the paradox of grace and freedom is one essential presupposition of helpful discussion of the problem.

JOHN C. BENNETT

Union Theological Seminary

Faith and History: A Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History. By Reinhold Niebuhr. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949, pp. viii + 257. \$3.50.

When I first examined this book I asked inwardly, Can Niebuhr have anything more to say on this subject? I must say now in answer that, though there is nothing absolutely new or for which the groundwork had not been laid in previous works, *Faith and History* is an uncommonly fresh, vigorous, and well-executed treatment of its basic single theme. The typical traits of Niebuhr, both as rhetorician and thinker, are here (the book incidentally is based on material first presented as the Lyman Beecher Lectures at Yale); but the style is simpler, the touch surer, the material better digested and the cumulative effect stronger than in the Gifford Lectures on *The Nature and Destiny of Man*.

What is Niebuhr, primarily? He is not, in the main, a philosopher or systematic theologian or biblical scholar or historian, although he is something of all these. He is fundamentally a prophet. He has the prophet's monotony and circularity in what he says. He has a biblical dimension of transcendence, to which he constantly recurs and insists that all judgments shall recur. But the burden of his message is not a simple, "Thus saith the Lord!" And the mind of this prophet is not an unsophisticated Arcadian intellect, like that of Amos.

Niebuhr is, above all, the prophet of the complex. His adversary is an illusory and unexamined simplicity. Christianity, one feels, appeals to him and has merit above all other general views of the world and life because it is complex, reserved about clear-cut final answers, and essentially paradoxical. It preserves without attenuation the contradictoriness of reality and experience. Maintaining the full reality of the contradiction, resisting the reduction of the complex, and yet asserting firmly that

some way, somehow, Christianity has an answer—these are the *leitmotifs* of this monograph of sophisticated prophecy and persistent if muted faith-affirmation.

The starting-point of Dr. Niebuhr's reflections on *Faith and History* seems to have been the converse of characteristic nineteenth century apologetic introduced into many Lyman Beecher Lectures. "Since several Beecher lecturers in the past half-century sought to accommodate the Christian message to the prevailing evolutionary optimism of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, I thought it might be particularly appropriate to consider the spiritual situation in a period in which this evolutionary optimism is in the process of decay." Dr. Niebuhr then proceeds to point out what has happened in terms of fact to the belief most unificative of modern culture, that history is itself redemptive. After this he traces the history of this faith in history and contrasts, in a now familiar manner, the classic and modern approaches to the historic process, sketching in successive chapters the part played by concepts of time, meaning in history, freedom, and the identification of freedom and virtue. The accent here as in the work generally is on the modern view.

The last eight of fourteen chapters are devoted to the Biblical and Christian contribution. This section of the essay is rich in insights, in expositions of Biblical positions, in analysis and criticism of opposing views or simple solutions within Christian history. The Christian paradox in its mobility and superior relevance is brilliantly maintained. A rigorously "existential" position is held as against the positivism of Catholic, Orthodox Protestant, and Liberal theologies. Ethical and social antinomies are referred back to the Transcendent beyond the paradox for ultimate solution.

With a very great deal of the "Christian" part of this work I find myself, as always with Reinhold Niebuhr, carried along and unable to disagree. He is modern to his finger-tips, not only modern but immediately contemporary, as much so as W. H. Auden in poetry. The enveloping circularity of his prophetic parallelisms (a comparison more than whimsical) holds in even an uneasy mind, like a person entangled in a copious blanket of many folds. It is not hard to understand his incomparable fascination

as preacher and author for intellectuals of our time.

It is, when one comes to consolidate one's gains behind the seemingly heavy guns of Niebuhr's theological counter-offensive that doubt arises. He alludes constantly and impressively to that which he defends and affirms, the Christian Faith, the Gospel of the Cross and Resurrection, but his incursions into constructive analysis and theological synthesis leave the impression as in earlier works, that what the preacher is really pointing to and feels solidly convinced of, is something vague and shadowy in outline, as likely to be the projection into the unknown spiritual stratosphere of human desperation as the image of the heavenly, known in Jesus Christ to have come down out of heaven and made itself known to men.

The matter may be briefly put in this way: Dr. Niebuhr is much more satisfactory on faith, conceived of as an act of the whole personality and the form of a particular existence, in some way connected with Jesus of Nazareth and the Christian Church, than he is on what this faith is and why all men should accept it. To illustrate, he attacks, in connection with a discussion of the Resurrection, the resort to miracle as evidence. This is unfaith. I find it, however, a very heavy strain on faith and reason alike to believe that the Church from St. Paul on (and I think much earlier, for survival could have meant only one thing to a Jew) was founded on a myth that certainly but for unfaith would never have been "projected" into existence.

Perhaps there is still room for *simplicitas* in thought as in life, despite all the complexity and the contradiction of existence in the twentieth century.

CHARLES W. LOWRY

Chevy Chase, Maryland

Mysticism in Religion. By W. R. Inge. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. pp. 168. \$3.50.

Fifty years ago, in his Bampton Lectures, Dr. Inge introduced many students to mysticism as a normal feature of religion. He has spent much of the intervening half century in studying accounts of religious phenomena and philosophies having to do with personal experience rather than acceptance of external authority un-

related to personal life. His conclusions are summed up in this little book. From time to time he wonders whether a "very old man" (so he describes himself) should write a book. It is no exaggeration to say that this very old man certainly should have written this book.

Two common errors are laid low by Dr. Inge whose pen has lost none of its familiar trenchancy. The first is the identification of mysticism with all sorts of phenomena and so to confuse it with pantheism that some writers are constantly apologizing and either defending some kind of pantheism or laboring to explain that "this is not pantheism". The second is the inevitable reaction to the emotionalism and sentimentality and cloudy thinking which usually characterize the first. Many intellectuals dismiss mysticism curtly as impossible and therefore conclude that all records of mystical experiences are the work of either fools or knaves—ignoramuses or charlatans.

Dr. Inge rules out of consideration all those cheaper accounts which might well be classified as exponents of "mysticism". "I cannot accept any definition which identifies mysticism with excited or hysterical emotionalism, with sublimated eroticism, with visions and revelations, with supernatural (dualistically opposed to natural) activities nor, on the philosophical side, with irrationalism" (p. 154).

He has no brief for subjectivism. He prefers the word *contemplation*. (p. 158) which by definition implies an object to be contemplated. He makes short shrift of the modern assumption which confuses God with the world and makes each contingent upon the other. "If the doctrine of entropy . . . is true and the universe is slowly running down like a clock, this God (i.e., the emergent God) is under sentence of death . . . for without the world, according to these thinkers, he is nothing" (p. 48). He uses this argument despite the difficulty for a Plotinian Platonist to accept the doctrine of entropy (p. 62).

The chief problem presented by mysticism is left untouched by Dr. Inge. In mystical experiences there is no common given which may be studied concurrently with the experience and by a number of observers. This makes difficult, if not impossible, a criterion by which some check may be made upon the validity of a purported experience. We are limited to the unchecked, finite, individual judgment and mem-

ory of those who try to recall and evaluate an experience which has ceased to exist before the study has commenced.

Dr. Inge does not even give the criterion by which he rules out many phenomena which, by other writers, are associated with mysticism. He has made the best case possible for intuitive knowledge of something which the subject may identify as God. The claim can be neither proved nor disproved. Such an experience may well support an already established belief in God. However, it can have no apologetic value, nor can it be classified with any inductive process of reasoning.

Dr. Inge's hope is that the mystical side of religion, which has not had fair representation in western Christianity, will receive support and clarification from Russian theologians whose works are now being rendered into English.

ROYDEN KEITH YERKES

Chicago, Illinois

History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha. By Robert H. Pfeiffer. New York: Harper, 1949, pp. xii + 561. \$4.00.

Professor Pfeiffer's *Introduction to the Old Testament* is one of the "great" books in modern theological literature. It is widely used as a textbook and as a standard work of reference, and will probably continue in use for many years to come. The author has now supplemented it with a magnificent *Introduction to the Apocrypha*, which is characterized by the same sound, thorough scholarship, wide range of view, accurate analysis of the contents of books, ample bibliographies, and profound historical understanding. The main interest of the book is not, in spite of the title, historical but literary: the historical chapters are there so that the literature may be better understood. And yet, so thorough are they, and so well-balanced, that the teacher of a course in history (with some reference to the literature) could use them.

Part I (230 pp.) deals with the history, literature, and religion of Judaism from 200 B.C. to A.D. 200. The section on Palestinian Judaism deals with political history, religious, and literary; the section on Hellenistic Judaism deals with Hellenism (history, literature, science, scholarship, philosophy, and religion), with the Jews

in the lands of their dispersion, and with the Alexandrian-Jewish literature. This is a truly wonderful survey. The ordinary student cannot read the latest edition of Schürer (and that is over forty years old; the English translation is sixty years old!), and cannot obtain or perhaps read Juster, Volz, Kittel, or Bonsirven. It is a great boon to have this thorough survey of up-to-date research in the field of ancient Judaism. (For works in English cover only a part of the area; the student should also have access to French and German works and those in still other languages).

Part II (289 pp.) is the most thorough introduction to the Books of the Apocrypha that I have ever read. It is much more than a survey of the modern "literature of the subject"—it also presents independent, constructive judgments: e.g. on the date of Wisdom. More students are reading the Apocrypha every year. It is fortunate that they now have available such a magnificent introduction and guide as the present volume.

FREDERICK C. GRANT

Union Theological Seminary

NOTES ON NEW BOOKS

Einleitung in das Alte Testament. By Artur Weiser. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1949, pp. 337. DM 14; bound, DM 16.50 (\$4.95).

It is a great satisfaction to begin receiving review-books from Germany once more; for it is a sign of the survival—or revival—of the theological vitality of the German church. This volume is a revised and enlarged edition of the excellent Introduction to the Old Testament by Artur Weiser of Tübingen; the first edition was published ten years ago (Stuttgart, 1939), i.e. at the beginning of the War, and hence is almost unknown in this country. The new edition is up to date in its bibliographies, even including many British and American works, and it is dedicated to Professors Porteous of Edinburgh and Rowley of Manchester. It is larger than the original by the addition of a fourth main division, treating the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha. For all this, the book is not unwieldy, but gives in compact form the generally held views of the present day, with a survey of opinion and brief statements of reasons for supporting or rejecting alternative views. In brief, it has the best characteristics of a sound German textbook.

One of the main features is the constant emphasis upon the origin of the various literary types—a study in which modern German scholars, from Gunkel to Hempel, have led the way. For example, it is not enough to unravel the strands in the Hexateuch, by a process of discriminating literary analysis. One must know *why* the various strands were collected; *where*; *when*; for what purpose; and how they were

related to the fragmentary legends, laws, anecdotes, local histories, etc. which preceded them. The long § 13 deals with this problem—or these problems—and discusses in some detail the theories of Mowinckel and Von Rad. The chapter is one which ought to interest all Biblical students, New Testament as well as Old, also students of History of Religions, and many others; for the fundamental subject here is not only Form Criticism of the Pentateuch, but the whole matter of Semitic Historiography; and this subject ramifies out in a hundred directions. It is good that students are beginning to have their attention drawn to it, and as competently as by such teachers and textbook writers as Weiser. This is a magnificent brief Introduction, and belongs on the same shelf with the great ones of the past and present. I think it will prove useful to students for many years to come.

F. C. G.

Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. Bd. V, Lfg. 2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1948, pp. 65-128. DM 3.90.

In the January, 1948 issue we described the first Lieferung of Vol. V, which though published in December 1944 had just reached us in this country. It was the installment with which the ThWB came to a halt during the War. The first installment of the continuation has now come to hand (pub. Sept. 1948), and we understand that the work is to be continued, now, to the end. Presumably—it is only a guess—there will be three more volumes.

The lamented editor, Dr. Gerhard Kittel, died

on July 11, 1948. He had resumed his work on the ThWB, after the War, and during the period immediately following the cessation of hostilities he had worked steadily upon the project in the library of the old Benedictine monastery at Beuron in Hohenzollern. His successor is Dr. Gerhard Friedrich of the Theological School Bethel, who has been one of Dr. Kittel's collaborators and recently his assistant. He is thoroughly conversant with the undertaking and its methods and standards; we can be assured that the ThWB will continue at the same high level.

The present *Lieferung* is mainly a continuation of the art. *kodōs* (begun in V. 1), and ends in the midst of the art. *oikos*. It is hoped that succeeding *Lieferungen* will appear at quarterly intervals. Meanwhile, the earlier volumes are being reprinted, so that this indispensable work will be once more available to students of NT, OT, Hist. of Religions, Doctrine, and Theology generally—even students of classics make use of it—no one can use it without profit. It would be a great advantage to English-speaking students if a translation could be made and published. This is the greatest Theological Lexicon of the NT ever published anywhere! F. C. G.

The Symbol of the Faith. By George Hedley. New York: Macmillan, 1948, pp. 173. \$2.50.

This exposition of the Apostles' Creed will have little appeal for catholic-minded Christians. Dr. Hedley is a professor of Economics and Sociology at Mills College and a Protestant minister. His book is almost incredibly "liberal". The main idea permeating the whole book seems to be that the less basis a proposition has in fact, the *truer* it is. The best way of appreciating the Creed is to begin by denying that it states any facts. It is a great "symbol". By this the author seems to mean that the right way to think of the Creed is not on the premise that it means what it says, but rather that it means what you mean it to mean. A thing may not be a fact and yet still be true!

P. S. K.

Secular Illusion or Christian Realism. By D. R. Davies. New York: Macmillan, 1948, pp. 111. \$2.00.

Another book by Dr. Davies emphasizing anew

his now familiar thesis that the only realistic view of human nature is that which recognizes it as utterly hopeless. According to the author, the only alternative to a facile secular optimism about necessary and inevitable progress is a reassertion of the total depravity of human nature. Redemption, however, is possible by God's act in Christ. The achievement of salvation may be attained by belief, repentance, and a closer and deeper association with the Church and her sacramental life.

P. S. K.

Purity of Heart is to Will One Thing. By Søren Kierkegaard. Translated and with an Introduction by Douglas V. Steere. Revised Edition, New York: Harpers, 1948, pp. 220. \$2.50.

This translation of *Purity of Heart* was first issued in 1938. For the fourth printing Douglas Steere has made "a very thorough re-examination of the translation from the Danish in order to correct certain errors and misprints and in places to improve the form of expression." The excellent Introduction of 1938 has been reprinted, and a Note to the revised edition is added in which Professor Steere says he is "still of Professor Eduard Geismar's opinion that there is no better way to begin to grasp Kierkegaard's religious message than to read *Purity of Heart*."

The printing and binding are beautifully done.

H. H. G.

The House of Nasi: Dona Gracia. By Cecil Roth. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1947, pp. xiii + 208 + 15 illus. \$3.00.

The House of Nasi: The Duke of Naxos. By Cecil Roth. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1948, pp. xvi + 250 + 15 illus. \$3.00.

Cecil Roth is the author of a number of books on Jewish history. In the first of the above he presents a biography of a sixteenth century Jewess who married into the famous banking house of Mendez and herself took charge of the family interests after the death of her husband and of her brother-in-law. She was born a Marrano, that is, secretly a Jewess though outwardly a Christian, and longed to profess her faith openly. Her struggle to escape from the inquisition and return to Judaism was successful,

and she thenceforth devoted herself to helping other Marranos do likewise.

Joseph Nasi was the nephew of Dona Gracia who after a period of wandering—occasioned ultimately by the expulsion of the Jews from Spain—settled in Turkey, where his services to the Sultan, made possible by his “underground” connections in Europe, earned him the Duchy of Naxos. For reasons of safety he had to remain at court as a duke *in absentia*, but like his aunt he was deeply concerned for the fate of his fellow Jews. He envisaged first Cyprus, of which he hoped to be made king, and then Palestine as the solution to the problem of the Jews, who were then as now “D.P.’s”; he was in fact one of the forerunners of Herzlian Zionism. Both volumes are well written, and the striking similarity of the problems and proposed solutions of the sixteenth century to those of our own day lends much interest.

H. H. G.

Sermons and Discourses. By John Henry Newman. Edited by Charles Frederick Harrold. New York: Longmans, Green, 1949. Two volumes, \$3.50 each.

These two volumes continue the edition of the works of Newman being published by Longmans, Green, and Company, and are uniform with the volumes already published (*Apologia pro Vita Sua*, *Grammar of Assent*, *Idea of a University*, and *Essays and Sketches* in three volumes). Professor Harrold has provided prefaces and an index for each volume.

H. H. G.

Passover: Its History and Traditions. By Theodor H. Gaster. Schuman. \$2.50.

This attractively illustrated popular account of the feast of Passover is one that will interest Christians, as well as Jews, since the Jewish Passover festival is the background of the Christian eucharist. In spite of some statements which historians of religion will question, the general picture is accurate enough, and the book ought to be widely read.

F. C. G.

Crockford's Clerical Directory 1948. London: Oxford University Press (Geoffrey Cumberlege), 1948, pp. xxviii + 2044 + xi maps, supplement. \$28.00.

Crockford Prefaces: The Editor Looks Back. London and New York: Oxford University Press (Geoffrey Cumberlege), 1947, pp. xi + 300. \$4.00.

The first volume listed is the seventy-second issue of the directory of the Church of England. The second is a reprinting of parts of the prefaces to the issues of the *Directory* in the years 1921-1941 and of the Supplements to the *Directory* of 1941-44. It comprises a fairly full record of the doings of the Church Assembly and of what was said in Crockford year by year about the Penions Measure, the Supply of Candidates for Holy Orders, and the Financial Position of the Clergy. A selection of remarks on other subjects and of correspondence with replies thereto makes up most of the rest.

H. H. G.

The Reunion of the Church. By J. E. Lesslie Newbigin. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949, pp. 192. \$3.00.

This is an American edition of the book by Bishop Newbigin that was treated in the review article by Dean Roach in the January 1949 issue of this Review.

H. H. G.

Nature, Man and God. By William Temple. New York: Macmillan, 1949, pp. xxxii + 530. \$6.00.

This is the much-needed third reprinting of Temple's Gifford Lectures, first published in 1934.

H. H. G.

The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches. By Ernst Troeltsch. Translated by Olive Wyon, with an introductory note by Charles Gore. New York: Macmillan, 1949. Two Volumes, pp. 1019. \$13.00.

This translation of Troeltsch's famous work was first published in 1931, and is now reprinted as number 1 of the Halley Stewart Publications.

H. H. G.

A Note by the Editor

The ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW is now in its thirty-first year. It represents a labor of love on the part of a group of scholars in the Protestant Episcopal Church who have kept it going, now for over a quarter-century. It has never had, and has not now, any "overhead" of any kind—salaries, expense accounts, or staff. Its only expenses are for the printing and distribution of the REVIEW. Its resources include subscriptions, a small income from advertising (of theological seminaries), and annual cash contributions made by members of the Editorial Board and the Cooperating Institutions—ten theological seminaries, the Church Congress of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and Trinity College. Since 1927, Seabury-Western Theological Seminary has generously provided an office for the REVIEW. It has always been solvent, and continues solvent today, in spite of periods of inflation, depression, and general economic disturbance. It was founded during World War I, has survived World War II, and we hope to keep it going through the years to come.

It exists to serve the Episcopal Church and specifically the theological interests of its clergy and other members. But it is also read by many persons outside the Episcopal Church; a large proportion of the subscribers are libraries, public, college and university, and theological. To all alike it seeks to interpret the Anglican tradition and outlook in theology, a tradition and an outlook which combine wide freedom with firm conviction, comprehension with catholicity, broad sympathy and understanding with a basic loyalty to the Christian faith "as this Church hath received the same."

Scholarly, authoritative articles by writers of recognized rank; book reviews and notes on new books by experts in their several fields; extended critiques; Notes and Comments, for briefer and sometimes technical contributions; the quarterly *syllabi* of the Church Congress, widely used by study groups throughout the Church—these characterize the ANGLICAN THEOLOGICAL REVIEW.

Your subscription is earnestly solicited, if you are not now a subscriber. And if you are in a position to share with us in subsidizing the REVIEW, a larger contribution will be most welcome.

Subscriptions and financial contributions should be sent to the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

Contributed articles should be sent to the Rev. Frederick C. Grant, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, New York.

Book reviews should be sent to the Rev. Holt H. Graham, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

For reprints of *Church Congress syllabi*, address the Rev. Stanley W. Ellis, Secretary, 233 Clarendon Street, Boston 16, Massachusetts.

Inquiries relating to *back numbers* of the REVIEW, including sets (a very few sets are still in stock), should be addressed to the Rev. Percy V. Norwood, 600 Haven Street, Evanston, Illinois.

The General Theological Seminary

Chelsea Square : New York 11, N. Y.

Under the control of the General Convention

Three-year undergraduate course of prescribed and elective study.

Four-year course for graduates, offering larger opportunities for specialization.

Provision for more advanced work, leading to degrees of S.T.M. and D.Th.

For catalogue and further details address

THE DEAN

1 CHELSEA SQUARE

NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

Berkeley Divinity School

FOUNDED 1854



38 Hillhouse Avenue

New Haven, Conn.

Affiliated with Yale University



For information write to the Dean

Seabury-Western Theological Seminary



A Graduate School of
Theology

formed by the union of
Seabury Divinity School and
Western Theological Seminary



For Catalogue and Additional
Information Address

THE DEAN

600 Haven Street Evanston, Illinois

